

FBIS**DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS*****Soviet Union*****Vol III No 223****17 November 1983****INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS****DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR**

Latest U.S. INF Proposals Said Unacceptable	AA 1
'Premeditated' Attempt To 'Delude'	AA 1
[Editorial in IZVESTIYA 17 Nov]	
Attempt To 'Disarm' USSR	AA 2
[Soltan]	
History of Euromissile Deployment Plans Portrayed	AA 3
[Kozyakov]	
Afanasyev Cited at Vienna Disarmament Conference	AA 4
Cruise Makes Geneva Talks 'Pointless'	AA 4
[Vienna ORF]	

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

USSR Supports 'Territorial Integrity' of Cyprus	CC 1
UN General Assembly Debate on Falklands Reported	CC 1
UN Political Committee Discusses Disarmament	CC 1
[Soldatov in IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]	
Proceedings of UNESCO Conference on Media Noted	CC 2
USSR Submits Draft Resolution	CC 3

UNITED STATES & CANADA

U.S.-Soviet Relations Reviewed on Anniversary	A 1
'Good Relations' With U.S. Sought	A 1
[Editorial Article in IZVESTIYA 17 Nov]	
History of Relations Detailed	A 3
[Bovin in IZVESTIYA 16 Nov]	
Bogdanov Interviewed on Ties	A 6
President Sends Message on Diplomatic Anniversary	A 8
Grenada Shows U.S. Policy's 'Repulsive Nature'	A 8
[Zagladin in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Nov]	

NORTHEAST ASIA

Weekly Hints ROK Leader Knew of Blast in Advance	C 1
DPRK 'Strongly Condemns' Reagan's S. Korean Trip	C 1
S. Korean Students Arrested in Clashes	C 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Romania Calls on Europe, U.S. To Defer Deployment	F 1
Soviet-Hungarian Commission Meets in Yerevan	F 1
Talks Begin [SOVETAKAN AYASTAN 11 Oct]	F 1
Session Ends [SOVETAKAN AYASTAN 15 Oct]	F 2
Demichev Receives Hungarian Front Delegation	F 3
Kuznetsov Presents Award to Hungarian Official	F 3
Ryabov Surveys Economic Ties With Hungary	F 3
[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 45]	

WESTERN EUROPE

Zamyatin, Chervov Meet With Netherlands MP's	G 1
Zamyatin Addresses Parliament	G 1
Thatcher 'Pretending' To Forget Andropov Warning	G 2
UK Government 'Intends To Ignore' Protests	G 3
IZVESTIYA Views State of UK-USSR Relations	G 3
[Skosyrev, 12 Nov]	
Italian Deputies Endorse Missile Deployment	G 6
PRAVDA Rounds Up Recent Cyprus Developments [17 Nov]	G 6
Shabayev: U.S. To Use Cyprus in Lebanon Plans	G 7

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Commentary on Khaddam's Visit to Moscow	H 1
[Timoshkin]	
Syrian Press Cited on U.S., Israeli 'Threats'	H 2
U.S., Israeli Activity in Mideast Discussed	H 2
U.S. 'Threatens' Grenada 'Tactics'	H 2
[Losev]	
'Exacerbating' Situation	H 3
[Nikolayev]	
'Saber-Rattling'	H 4
[Glukhov in PRAVDA 15 Nov]	
USSR Views on Multinational Force in Lebanon	H 5
[Stepanov in NOVOYE VREMYA 11 Nov]	

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Madagascar Foreign Minister Visits Moscow	J 1
Bembananjara Arrives	J 1
Meets With Gromyko	J 1
[PRAVDA 16 Nov]	
USSR, Angola Agencies Sign Cultural Plan	J 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Nov]	
Ponomarev Meets With Cape Verde Delegation	J 2
[PRAVDA 16 Nov]	

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Cuba Proclaims National Period of Mourning	K 1
U.S. Charged With 'Petty Fraud' in Figures	K 1
[Fedorov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Nov]	
OAS Session Criticizes Reagan Policy	K 2
PRAVDA on U.S. 'Policy of Terror' in Grenada	K 3
[12 Nov]	
Commentator Views U.S. 'Plans' for Nicaragua	K 4
[Olin]	

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Supreme Soviet Debates Finland Treaty, Budget	R 1
[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]	
Comparison of Report on Chernenko-Chaired Meeting	R 3
Aliyev, Delegation Make Tashkent Stopover 4 Nov	R 3
[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 6 Nov]	
Shevardnadze Addresses Chairmen of Local Soviets	R 4
[ZARYA VOSTOKA 27 Sep]	
Shevardnadze Addresses Science, Technology Council	R 26
[ZARYA VOSTOKA 22 Sep]	

LATEST U.S. INF PROPOSALS SAID UNACCEPTABLE

'Premeditated' Attempt To 'Delude'

PM161647 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Nov 83 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial under the rubric "Topical Themes": "The Old Commodity"]

[Text] The attempts by the Reagan administration to deceive and confuse world public opinion are continuing. After encountering an antimissile movement in West Europe hitherto unprecedented in scale, Washington has made public its next "new proposals" for the Geneva talks.

"We are displaying flexibility," was how a State Department spokesman advertised them. "We will stay at the negotiating table," proclaimed U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, as though this were the greatest kindness on the part of the White House.

The very first acquaintance with the latest U.S. proposals makes it clear that they contain nothing "new," no "flexibility," and -- the main thing -- no aspiration to resolve the problem of limiting nuclear armaments in Europe. On the contrary, yet another step has been taken toward excluding the prospect of agreement and initiating a new spiral of the arms race.

And it is by no means fortuitous that Reagan's diplomacy has undertaken yet another political propaganda action simultaneously with the actual start of the deployment of the new types of missiles in West Europe. Cables concerning Washington's "flexible" initiative arrived in Europe at the same time as the transport aircraft which brought the first two containers of cruise missiles to the Greenham Common base in Britain.

But let us turn for a moment from the strange and terrible appearance offered in practice by the American "flexibility." Let us investigate the latest U.S. proposals -- as the ancient Romans would say -- "calmly and rationally." It will become clear that:

-- They include in the form of an ultimatum the demand that we agree to the deployment in West Europe of new American medium-range nuclear missiles capable of hitting major targets on USSR territory and thereby possessing strategic significance.

-- They again demand unilateral disarmament from the Soviet Union, and the "norms" established for the USSR also include, moreover, missiles installed in the Asian part of the country.

-- The Reagan administration document again, and categorically, refuses to consider as part of the overall NATO balance the nuclear means of Britain and France targeted -- like the American weapons -- on the Soviet Union.

Thus, Washington's new "initiative" is replete with all those same unacceptable postulates which repudiate the principle of the sides' equal security and completely ignore the specific peace initiatives of the Soviet Union.

As THE NEW YORK TIMES remarked -- and right it was -- even before the publication of its proposals Washington was confident that "the Soviet Union will reject this plan." This means that what we have here is a premeditated operation designed to delude world public opinion, to the effect that Reagan "is doing something" for the talks.

But this is merely the first task, which is the responsibility of the department of Washington's propaganda services. The U.S. Administration's second task is far more dangerous. This is a matter of the continuation of the course toward the complete breakdown of the talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe.

Attempt To 'Disarm' USSR

LD1616C5 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] There have been many comments these days in Washington and other NATO capitals about the United States coming out in Geneva with a so-called new initiative that paves the way to an agreement on limiting medium-range nuclear missiles. Yuriy Soltan writes:

There is much talk, but no more sincere desire now than there ever was to reach agreement on the basis of equality and equal security. What is the United States proposing? To set a global parity on warheads on Soviet and American medium-range missiles -- the figure is 420. But what will that kind of American so-called parity lead to? The limit set on Soviet SS-20's is 140 launchers. All other Soviet missiles are supposed to be dismantled and not only in the European zone, but also in the Asian part of the country.

In other words, the United States is clearly trying to disarm the Soviet Union in regions that have nothing to do with the talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe. Second, the United States still refuses to count the 162 British and French medium-range nuclear missiles targeted at the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Furthermore, in addition to these missiles they want to add their medium-range nuclear missiles that would carry 420 warheads. And so that plan, which would openly give NATO more than double nuclear superiority in terms of medium-range missiles, is what the United States is presenting as a supposedly new initiative.

I doubt that those who are putting forth and praising this plan believe that it could be given serious consideration at the Geneva talks. Even THE NEW YORK TIMES has commented that the Reagan administration's pretence at flexibility is prompted by a desire to politically disarm and neutralize mounting protests on both sides of the Atlantic against the siting of the Pershings and cruise missiles in Western Europe.

The Soviet Union has proposed a radical solution in Geneva to rid Europe entirely of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. And it has another proposal, to reduce by three times the number of medium-range nuclear missiles already deployed in Europe. If a mutually acceptable agreement is reached, provided the United States (?renounces plans) to deploy its missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union is prepared to leave in its European zone about 140 SS-20 launchers with 420 warheads; that is, much less than the medium-range missiles Britain and France have. And the Soviet Union is prepared to freeze the number of medium-range missiles it has in the Asian part of the country.

The Americans have taken the figure of 140 missiles with 420 warheads out of the general context of Soviet initiatives and included it in their own proposals, but the conditions the United States is putting forward makes the so-called new United States proposal the same as the old interim solution, totally unacceptable for the Soviet Union. Why unacceptable? Because it flagrantly violates the principle of equality and equal security.

HISTORY OF EUROMISSILE DEPLOYMENT PLANS PORTRAYED

LD160936 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Nov 83

[Vladislav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] And now a commentary over the arrival in Britain on Monday of the first batch of American cruise missiles at the Greenham Common military base. The commentary was contributed by our news analyst Vladislav Kozyakov. Here is what he writes:

To take the edge off the anxiety and outrage of the Western public over these American and NATO nuclear preparations, Washington leaders are repeating their claims about Soviet SS-20 missiles, saying the whole point is that the West must now retaliate. As America's leaders do it usually, they falsify facts patently. The currently started supplies of new American nuclear missiles to Western Europe have quite a record, linked with persistent unceasing efforts by the U.S. ruling quarters to get a nuclear superiority, ignoring the really tragic consequences the line to intensify nuclear confrontation leads to.

American cruise and Pershing II missiles were developed well before the Soviet SS-20's: The record of the new generation of American intermediate-range nuclear missiles ought to be started not from 1977, as Washington claims, but much earlier. U.S. munitions corporation began developing these missiles in the late sixties and early seventies. Back in 1975, when the Soviet Union had no SS-20's in its forces, U.S. Congress already set aside additional appropriations to the Pentagon for these very same Pershing II and cruise missiles. A former NATO Headquarters clerk, Emelda Therop, who worked at the time in the International Secretariat of this body, said back in 1975 she had copied documents which mentioned the deployment of qualitatively new types of nuclear arms in Western Europe. At that time, in 1975, there was no mention yet anywhere in the West that the Soviet Union had the SS-20, the former NATO headquarters clerk told newsmen. And for this reason the NATO attempt to justify the desire to deploy the new missiles by referring to a need to rearm was a lie and deception of the public.

I may also remind you that as far back as January 1976, the then U.S. secretary of defense, Donald Rumsfeld, submitted to the NATO Nuclear Planning Group meeting in Hamburg, West Germany, a plan for pushing cruise and Pershing II on NATO's forces in Western Europe. NATO soon accepted the plan and action began. In its Memorandum No 10, prepared by the U.S. National Security Council as early as in the summer of 1977, the Pentagon banked on deploying American-made intermediate-range missiles in Europe, and on a surprise nuclear strike on Soviet strategic forces and command posts.

Thus, even before the SS-20's appeared, work was full steam ahead in Washington and NATO to develop new types of intermediate-range nuclear weapons. In addition to the hundreds of American, British, and French nuclear-capable aircraft of medium range, in addition to the British and French intermediate-range nuclear missiles, in addition to these NATO forces in Europe, plans were made to develop and deploy on the continent Pershing II and cruise missiles as well. That was a stake on breaking down the equilibrium of forces in Europe and globally to give the United States and NATO military supremacy over the USSR.

Not surprisingly, the current American Administration has been especially persistent in trying to force these dangerous plans. These plans fit rather well in Reagan's adventurist strategy of waging a limited or protracted nuclear war which will amount to a worldwide holocaust.

AFANASYEV CITED AT VIENNA DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

LD162010 Moscow TASS in English 1939 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Vienna November 16 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vadim Ivanov reports: The Second World Conference-Dialogue on the Problems of Disarmament and Detente is continuing here, with discussions now taking place in specialized groups that unite journalists, trade unionists and representatives of women's groups and religious and other organizations.

Many delegates have supported the Soviet proposals for averting nuclear catastrophe. The USSR's decision not to leave without a response the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Europe also met with understanding on their part. Michael Tomopoulos, deputy chairman of the Greek Committee for International Detente and Peace and member of the "Generals for Peace and Disarmament" group, said: "Washington's policy is directed at confrontation with the world of socialism; the USSR is compelled in these conditions to adopt measures to strengthen its security."

Explaining the USSR's position on nuclear arms reductions, leader of the Soviet delegation Viktor Afanasyev, editor-in-chief of the newspaper PRAVDA, told a press conference here: "By deploying its nuclear weapons in Europe, the United States clearly wants to deprive the USSR of the possibility of dealing a retaliatory strike. The new missiles will be able to reach our territory within three to eight minutes after being launched."

"This is why we will be compelled to adopt reply measures to restore the balance of forces in this field. But we continue to believe that contentious issues cannot be settled militarily; what is needed is dialogue," Afanasyev said.

His opinion is shared by British Labour MP James Lamond, president of the British Peace Assembly. If the "missile plan" was fulfilled, he said, the Soviet Union would of course have to take response measures. Lamond said the United States' invasion of Grenada was convincing "commentary" on its "missile policy" in Europe.

Speaking at the press conference, Jack O'Dell, member of the American delegation, said Grenada and the "missile plan" of the United States and NATO were links in the same chain, two integral parts of Washington's imperialist policy.

Cruise Makes Geneva Talks 'Pointless'

AU161446 Vienna ORF Teletext in German 1430 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Vienna -- V. Afanasyev, chief editor of the Soviet party paper PRAVDA, commented on the arrival of the first cruise missiles in Britain at the press conference in Vienna today.

The Geneva disarmament talks between the superpowers would be pointless if the deployment has already taken place in advance, Afanasyev stressed.

The Soviet Union will take corresponding measures to maintain the military balance, which would be endangered by the deployment of one single U.S. missile.

USSR SUPPORTS 'TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY' OF CYPRUS

LD161348 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] In the Security Council, closed-door consultations are going on in connection with the unilateral proclamation by the Turkish community of a so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The Government of Cyprus has stated that recognizing the action of the separatists is out of the question. For his part, the prime minister of Greece, Andreas Papandreu, accused Turkey, which has recognized the so-called republic, of violating UN resolutions. A Soviet delegate, Richard Ovinnikov, told newsmen after the consultations in the Security Council that the Soviet Union is for the territorial integrity of Cyprus, as is demanded by the UN decisions.

UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEBATE ON FALKLANDS REPORTED

LD161157 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Excerpts] New York November 16 TASS -- Raul Roa Kouri, permanent representative of Cuba at the United Nations, stated here on Tuesday that the conflict in the South Atlantic over the Malvinas Islands has revealed to the peoples of Latin America the true essence of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc headed by the United States.

Speaking at the current session of the UN General Assembly, he said that the manoeuvres being undertaken now with a view to extending NATO's sphere of influence over to the strategically important region of the world are a continuation of those imperialist intrigues.

At the same time a statement by John Adam Thompson, British representative at the United Nations, has shown that the obstructionist stand of London remains unchanged. He stated defiantly that Britain will never agree to negotiations on sovereignty over the Falkland Islands.

Britain's refusal to hold talks with Argentina, the talks envisaged by UN resolutions, and the course taken by Britain with U.S. and NATO backing towards the creation of a big military base on the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands are aimed at consolidating the colonial status of the territory. Those actions are fraught with a serious threat to international peace and security, said Oleg Troyanovskiy, permanent representative of the USSR at the United Nations.

UN POLITICAL COMMITTEE DISCUSSES DISARMAMENT

PM160914 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 83 Morning Edition p 1, 5

[Own correspondent V. Soldatov dispatch under the "Topical Themes" rubric: "Soviet Initiatives Approved"]

[Text] New York -- The general discussion in the UN General Assembly First (Political) Committee has reaffirmed that the majority of UN member states are extremely worried by the dangerous development of events in the world and advocate the adoption of measures which would help to avert the nuclear threat and reduce international tension. There was an unusually large number of questions of this type -- 23 -- on the committee's agenda.

Among those questions a particular place was taken by the new Soviet proposals: on condemning nuclear war, on a nuclear weapons freeze, and on concluding a treaty banning the use of force in space and from space against the earth. It was shown in the speeches of USSR representative V.F. Petrovskiy that the adoption of the new Soviet initiatives would promote the formation of a favorable political climate in the world and would complicate the actions of those who are formulating plans for the first use of nuclear weapons. A nuclear weapons freeze would raise the level of trust among countries and would make it possible to take a great step toward ending the arms race. The Soviet proposal on preventing the militarization of space answers an urgent task -- ensuring that space is used peacefully, and only peacefully -- in the interests and for the good of all peoples.

The Soviet proposals and other countries' initiatives aimed at averting the nuclear threat and ending the arms race were supported by the majority of Political Committee members.

The exchange of opinions, however, could have been more fruitful had the U.S. delegation not tried with great effort to steer the committee's work along a false path. Despite the obvious facts, the U.S. representatives tried to shift the responsibility from the United States for unleashing the nuclear arms race and for the lack of progress at the Geneva talks, which the United States is exploiting as a cover for implementing its course toward securing military superiority.

The U.S. representatives again employed a set of stock false accusations against the Soviet Union and, by way of certain U.S. allies, tried to push through the false thesis about an alleged equal U.S. and Soviet responsibility for the arms race and the lack of progress at the talks. The representatives of a number of countries convincingly showed that those truly responsible for the arms race are the U.S. militarist circles, which are trying to halt social changes in the world and to secure world supremacy for themselves. The representatives of a number of countries criticized the U.S. "limited" nuclear war doctrine and called on the United States and other nuclear powers to follow the Soviet Union's example and assume a commitment not to be first to use nuclear weapons.

The next stage of the Political Committee's work is the formulation of specific decisions on arms limitation and the strengthening of international security.

PROCEEDINGS OF UNESCO CONFERENCE ON MEDIA NOTED

LD111458 Moscow TASS in English 0857 GMT 11 Nov 83

[Text] Paris November 11 TASS -- Discussion has begun in a special commission of the 22nd session of the UNESCO general conference on questions related to the activity of that organization in the field of information.

Delegates note in their speeches the important role that the mass media are called upon to play in the solution of major problems of our time, primarily in strengthening peace and international security and in removing the threat of nuclear war. Spokesmen for the socialist and developing countries point out, however, that many influential organs of Western propaganda are being vigorously used by the forces which are hostile to peace and international cooperation in order to whip up tension and to conduct overt psychological warfare against socialist countries. Delegates of the GDR, Benin, Mongolia, India, Hungary, Ethiopia and other countries have said that these activities conflict with the declaration of the basic principles of the contribution of mass communications to strengthening peace and international mutual understanding, to the promotion of human rights and to the struggle against racism, apartheid and incitement of war that was approved by UNESCO in 1978. The implementation of that important document is being discussed by the current session as a special item on the agenda.

The Soviet delegate A. Grachev has said in his address that there is no avoiding the obvious fact that the mass communications are an ever more important component of today's world and have an ever more immediate effect on the prospects of its development, being by virtue of this directly responsible for the world's destiny. Regrettably, on many occasions the gigantic potentialities of mass communications are used as their tool by the forces seeking to worsen relations between countries and to sic some nations on others, while the concept of the "free flow of information" is being exploited as a means of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries. We cannot remain indifferent to the attempts to extend ideological struggle into state-to-state let alone military confrontation.

Western spokesmen who have addressed the meeting have tried to peddle the concept of "the free flow of information," to justify intervention in the internal affairs of other countries and to protect the policy of information imperialism pursued by the West's major transnational news corporations. The United States delegate attacked UNESCO, threatening it with financial "sanctions" and suspension of American donations to the organization if its activities in the field of information failed to correspond to the U.S. standards. Those attacks were strongly denounced by the majority of the delegates, in particular, by representatives of the developing countries.

The commission attaches special attention to aid to the developing countries in establishing and expanding national mass communications. The international program for the development of communication sponsored by UNESCO has won broad support. A report on the program activities was delivered by Gunnar Garbo, chairman of the IPDC Intergovernmental Council. He noted the important contribution of socialist countries to the program and spoke highly of the results of the latest session of the IPDC Intergovernmental Council in Tashkent last September. At the same time the chairman strongly criticized a number of Western countries, which are actually sabotaging that major UNESCO program or trying to use it as a cover for their ideological penetration of the developing countries.

USSR Submits Draft Resolution

LD101943 Moscow TASS in English 1746 GMT 10 Nov 83

[Text] Paris November 10 TASS -- The Soviet delegation to the 22nd session of the UNESCO general conference taking place here has submitted a draft resolution calling upon governmental organizations to take proper measures so that the mass media should not be used to aggravate international tension. The draft also calls for a ban on the propagation of biased slanderous reports aimed at sowing discord and hatred in relations between nations.

UNESCO Assistant Director General Gerard Bolla, who addressed a meeting of the session, stressed the pressing need for establishing a new world information order oriented towards progress of the mass media, particularly in the developing countries. He pointed out that communication development programs featured prominently in the activities of UNESCO, which was giving aid to developing countries.

The U.S. delegate's address was a sample of an imperial approach to problems on the agenda which has already become traditional. Striking a posture of the defender of the "freedom of the press," he threatened that the United States would suspend its contributions to the UNESCO budget if the organization would displease Washington by its decisions on the development of communications. Obviously on cue from Washington, its NATO allies submitted proposals which actually amount to intervention in the internal affairs of other countries.

U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS REVIEWED ON ANNIVERSARY

'Good Relations' With U.S. Sought

PM161623 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Nov 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "On the 50th Anniversary of Diplomatic Relations Between the USSR and the United States; Lessons of History"]

[Text] Just 50 years ago, on 16 November 1933, diplomatic relations were established between the USSR and the United States.

In the past 5 decades the history of these bilateral relations has known many ups and downs. Its contradictory stages, such as cooperation within the framework of the anti-Hitler coalition and the cold war, the Caribbean crisis and the policy of detente, have reflected and at the same time formed the world political climate.

The very emergence on the world political map of a state rejecting the "sacred inviolability" of private ownership and proclaiming the principle of peaceful coexistence as the cornerstone of its foreign policy course was greeted in the United States as a blatantly "unfriendly action." There followed complicity in the collective attempt to stifle the young Soviet Republic. Then came the tactic of economic blockade and cordons sanitaires designed to exert a destructive influence on a state which was still taking shape. These calculations came to nothing.

By the early thirties the Soviet Union had strengthened economically, enhanced its defense capability, and become a substantial factor in international relations. Its importance was also increased by virtue of the fact that German fascism had reared its head in Europe, while in the Far East the Japanese expansionists were nurturing far-reaching plans. All this was taken into account by the U.S. leadership, for whom the fact that the line between Moscow and Washington had been disconnected had become a glaring anomaly.

Close contacts and coordinated actions in the period of joint struggle against fascist Germany were a demonstration of the possibility and -- the main thing -- the necessity of dealing with the Soviet Union as an equal and of respecting and considering its lawful interests. The pages of that comradeship in arms will remain forever in the memories of the U.S. and Soviet peoples. But a reservation is required here. The goals pursued by the U.S. ruling clique consisted primarily in weakening its most dangerous rivals -- not so much immediate rivals as rivals in the historical long term. That explains the delay in opening the "second front," the connivance of a number of U.S. monopolies with the German Reich, and the backstage talks at the end of the war to conclude a separate peace in the West. All these "zigzags" in Washington's policy left their mark on bilateral relations between our countries.

After the end of World War II the United States, which had lost nothing but had merely augmented its wealth and created a powerful military machine, unleashed a massive offensive against the positions of socialism. This period was called the cold war. Initially Washington used its nuclear monopoly for blackmail and threats. Then it began to launch new rounds of the arms race one after another. Washington in fact subordinated the content of its foreign policy to the endless escalation of tension between West and East. Essentially, from the Truman administration to the Reagan administration an endurance test for the USSR has been taking place under conditions of unconcealed hostility from the United States, backed up by various strategic doctrines of "massive retaliation," "flexible response," "limited" nuclear war, and so forth.

However, Washington politicians did not always dismiss out of hand any alternative to confrontation with the Soviet Union. In the early seventies, in the wake of the ignominious defeat in Vietnam and against the background of the profound international crises that had shaken the capitalist world, the United States took steps to normalize relations with the USSR. This stage was marked by important milestones on the path toward more lasting peace and international stability.

In 1972 a document was signed enshrining the "basic principles of relations" between the two countries. Both sides stated that they could see no principles for governing relations between the nuclear powers other than the principles of peaceful coexistence. Differences in ideology and social system, the document said, should not serve as a stumbling block for all-embracing dialogue between the USSR and the United States. A dialogue based on the principles of sovereignty, equality, noninterference in internal affairs, and mutual advantage.

When the Soviet Union achieved military-strategic parity with the United States, the latter's ruling circles stopped blocking the way to a mutually acceptable accord. Thus there appeared the treaty on the limitation of ABM systems, the SALT I Treaty, and the SALT II treaty. However, by the time the latter was signed the positive results of the policy of detente had made over-vulnerable the positions of the axis of power in the United States that is usually called the military-industrial complex. Under its pressure, Presidents G. Ford and J. Carter began to dismantle the foundation of bilateral relations laid during the thaw in the international climate. The present White House administration has not only vigorously continued this venture, or rather, return to the atmosphere of "crusades" against communism, but has also, by its adventurism, taken relations between West and East to an extremity beyond which there yawns the abyss of nuclear confrontation.

The predilection for a military-strongarm solution to international problems and conflicts also casts a sinister shadow on the bilateral talks being conducted in Geneva on limiting and reducing strategic arms and on limiting nuclear arms in Europe. Washington has deadlocked these talks with its deliberately unacceptable "proposals" which deny the principle of equality and identical security. In this way it wishes to remove possible obstacles to the buildup of its nuclear potential by means of the first-strike weapons being brought into Europe.

The United States is seeking to upset the present strategic equality and is seeking to acquire superiority in strength, which, according to its calculations, is to ensure its hegemony in international affairs. The example of the impudent, bandit-like attack on Grenada demonstrated to the whole world that the American leaders do not hesitate to flout international law and disregard the opinion of the community of nations. While declaring its intention to wage a "struggle against communism" in all the planet's hot spots, the U.S. leadership is at the same time curtailing contacts with the USSR in the political, scientific, and cultural spheres, and is trying to harm our state with the help of economic sanctions and "embargoes."

However, the escalation of tension that is inspired by the most reactionary groupings in the U.S. ruling elite does not paralyze the Soviet state's will, or fetter, contrary to the calculations, its struggle for the triumph of the cause of peace and social progress. The USSR confidently stands guard over socialism's gains, safeguards the interests of its friends and allies, and deals a resolute and timely rebuff to the intrigues of modern imperialists.

Nevertheless, at the present time, as the Soviet leaders have repeatedly declared, normal relations between the USSR and the United States are a most urgent necessity, since, under the conditions of acute nuclear confrontation, they bear tremendous responsibility not only for the fate of their peoples but also for the fate of peace.

Historical examples show that there is and can be no sensible alternative to peaceful coexistence and that, given a sober understanding of the political realities of the world today and goodwill, it is possible to reach agreement on any problem.

The difficult times that our relations are now going through do not close the road to establishing an honest and equitable partnership. The Soviet Union would like to have with the United States a level of agreement which would ensure normal, stable, good relations to the mutual advantage of both sides and to the great benefit of the cause of world peace. "The USSR wishes to live at peace with all countries, including the United States," says the statement of Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. This is our principled position.

The Soviet Union has an abundance of goodwill. The USSR's constructive peace-loving initiatives, which clear the way to lasting peace past the obstacles of enmity and mistrust, can serve as a reliable basis not only for effective international cooperation in resolving global problems of the present day, but also for establishing normal relations between our two powers. The historical experience of the past 50 years unambiguously attests that not only the American and Soviet people but also the interests of world peace would benefit from this.

History of Relations 'Detailed'

PM161706 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by own political observer A. Bovin under the "Problems and Opinions" rubric: "Fifty Years -- What Next?"]

[Text] The United States was the last major capitalist power to establish diplomatic relations with the USSR. And yet at the beginning it seemed that it could even have been the first. President W. Wilson -- an acknowledged liberal and thwarted reformer -- wrote in a message to the American Congress on 8 January 1918: "The attitude of our sister nations toward Russia in the coming months will be a touchstone of their goodwill and their comprehension of its needs... and of their enlightened and disinterested understanding." And at the end of March, rejecting the plan for joint intervention against Russia presented by Marshal Foch, Wilson stated: "In my opinion, an attempt to stop the revolutionary movement by dispatching an army is equivalent to attempting to stop a flood with a broom."

This kind of statement opened the way in principle to mutual understanding. But, unfortunately -- and we have since been convinced of this no few times -- the words of American politicians were decidedly at variance with their deeds. The "enlightened and disinterested understanding" turned out to mean the landing of American interventionists at Murmansk and Arkhangelsk, the dispatch of (Grey's) expeditionary corps to Siberia and the Far East, and the energetic support, along with other "sister nations," of the Russian counterrevolution.

In the twenties, official Washington did not bother to play the hypocrite. "My motto regarding the Reds," one American senator declared, "is deport them or shoot them. I think we should put them all on a stone ship rigged with lead sails and let their first port of call be the nether-regions." The attitude to the Soviet Union was similar. W. Harding, C. Coolidge, and H. Hoover, the presidents of big business and the last apologists of "rampant," merciless capitalism, would not hear of recognizing the country that had rejected the sacred principle of private property.

The "Great Depression" shook America. American society was gripped by fear and confusion. The collapse of the economy and the growth of social contradictions required a new policy and new politicians. And -- as often happens in history -- they emerged. In November 1932, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected U.S. president. The era of the "New Deal" began -- an era of vigorous use of state levers to regulate the economy. Roosevelt himself clearly expressed the class meaning of his policy: "I am fighting against communism... I want to save our system, the capitalist system." And he did everything possible to overcome capitalism's paralysis.

F. Roosevelt was a clever man and a far-seeing and subtle politician. He possessed a quality that is rare for a Western politician -- a sense of history. And he understood that the worst policy is the policy which turns its back on realities. The Soviet Union was the most real of the realities. The first socialist power in the world had overcome the after-effects of the imperialist war and the Civil War and endured the period of devastation and was now firmly standing on its own feet. And Roosevelt made a decision.

On 10 October 1933 the U.S. president sent a message to M.I. Kalinin, chairman of the USSR Central Executive Committee. "It is a great pity," the president wrote, "that two great peoples between whom a successful tradition of friendship beneficial to both sides has existed for more than a century should now find themselves without any practical method of direct relations with each other. The difficulties which have created this abnormal situation are serious but, in my opinion, not insoluble. However, the difficulties between our two great peoples can be removed only by frank, friendly talks." Roosevelt invited a Soviet Government representative to Washington to hold talks.

The reply came on 17 October. Agreeing with the president, M.I. Kalinin commented: "The abnormal situation which you correctly pointed out in your message has an unfavorable effect not only on the interests of the two states concerned but on the general international situation by increasing the factors of unease, complicating the process of strengthening world peace, and encouraging forces aimed at violating this peace." Kalinin's comment was fully understood by the president. Hitler's coming to power and the stepping up of Japanese militarism were transforming the postwar years into prewar years. And Roosevelt, in taking a decisive step toward Moscow, was guided not only by his own general concept of politics but by a concrete plan for expanding U.S. possibilities in the event of a dangerous development of events.

On 7 November 1933 M.M. Litvinov, USSR people's commissar for foreign affairs, arrived in Washington. Intensive and complex talks on political, economic, and financial questions began. A common will and desire to carry the matter through to a successful conclusion enabled them to avoid getting bogged down in detail. On 16 November an exchange of notes between the U.S. president and M.M. Litvinov on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the United States took place.

Five decades have passed since then. Fifty different years, quite unlike each other. The culmination of the first period was the joint USSR-U.S. struggle in the anti-Hitler coalition. The common danger brought them closer together and helped them, despite minor disagreements, to understand each other better. As the well-known American journalist W. Lippman wrote at the time, the USSR and the United States were "divided by an ideological gulf but linked by a bridge of national interests."

However, the bridge which had withstood the war could not withstand peace. Roosevelt's death brought about a rapid change of command in the White House. Monopoly possession of the atomic bomb encouraged the buildup of hegemonist aspirations. On 5 January 1946 U.S. President H. Truman wrote that it was necessary to oppose the Soviet Union with an "iron fist and tough language." Thus began the second period in the history of Soviet-American relations -- the period of the cold war, the period of "rolling back" socialism.

Washington's cold-war policy was aimed at using U. S. military-strategic superiority to bar the Soviet Union's entry into the world arena and to prevent the chain reaction of social changes that embraced the world after the destruction of fascism. But that was not what happened. The nuclear monopoly lasted just a few years. The dream of world hegemony, the notorious "pax Americana," burst like a bubble. The USSR's peace-loving policy was winning over an increasing number of supporters on all continents.

The 1962 Caribbean crisis showed that the edge of the abyss was near. The renowned British philosopher B. Russell wrote to U.S. President J. Kennedy at that time: "Your actions are desperate; they have no justification; we must not sink into mass murder. End the madness!" The madness was ended. The world breathed a sigh of relief. And as early as the following year something qualitatively new came about -- the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water was signed in Moscow on 5 August.

On the whole signs were appearing that Washington was gradually returning to common sense. But the Vietnam adventure slowed that process down for a long time. And it was only in the late sixties that the new period -- the period of detente -- began.

By that time military-strategic parity had taken shape between the USSR and the United States. This meant that U.S. security was determined less by the level of its strategic potential than by agreement with the USSR. President R. Nixon formulated the alternative to these terms: "Either we learn to live together, or we die together." After signing the first strategic arms limitation agreement, R. Nixon stated to Congress: "The foundations have been laid for new reciprocal relations between the two most powerful countries in the world." The president appealed to congressmen to help in raising on those foundations a "new edifice which could be a haven for mankind's hopes and a shelter against the storm of conflicts." Yes, such an edifice could have and should have been built. But it was not.

As early as 1976, U.S. President G. Ford issued orders that U.S. officials should cease using the word "detente." And even though President J. Carter signed the SALT II treaty, it was he who began to destroy it. Soviet-U.S. relations entered the fourth period -- a period of acute deterioration and aggravation. R. Reagan has supplied the finishing touches. As though returning to the times of Truman, the 40th U.S. President proclaimed Washington's "national goal" to be the achievement of "internal changes" in the Soviet Union. The vision of the world as a struggle between the "empire of good" and the "evil empire", a clear course toward the militarization of U.S. foreign policy, and overt hegemonist aspirations -- all this caused a crisis in Soviet-U.S. relations and, therefore, a crisis of detente.

The cyclical character of the development of Soviet-U.S. relations and the alternation between periods of detente and periods of confrontation are no coincidence. These changes in the political temperature reflect the confrontation between different factions and groups within the U.S. ruling class. Some think it necessary to adapt U.S. foreign policy to the changes taking place in the world, to consider the realities of the nuclear missile age, to take the Soviet Union's legitimate interests into account, and to seek mutually acceptable compromise. Others, blinded by hatred of communism, pin their hopes on force, count on upsetting the nuclear missile parity, declare virtually the whole world to be the sphere of U.S. "vital interests" and, at the same time, ignore the Soviet Union's security interests. It is this group in the U.S. bourgeoisie which back the present U.S. Administration's policy.

What will happen next? The Soviet Union, as always, is ready to normalize Soviet-U.S. relations. We have just one condition, but it is indispensable -- discussion on equal terms, and strict observance of the principle of equal security between the sides.

The United States, by all accounts, is not ready for this. The orgy of chauvinist fervor is continuing there. Militarist hysteria is continuing there. They are still pinning their hopes there on recarving the world according to the "great America" model. And if R. Reagan is returned to the White House -- how I would rather be wrong here! -- that would mean 4 more years of nervous tension, conflicts, arms race, and nuclear missile brinkmanship. However, I do not believe that Washington's politicians will risk taking the plunge. It is one thing to send another 100 or another 1,000 Marines to their deaths, but it is quite another to condemn oneself to death...

And after that? The general guidelines forming the basis of the Reagan administration's foreign policy are archaic and run counter to the direction of the historical process. The majority of the specific foreign policy tasks posed by Washington have no solutions. Thus it may be supposed that Washington's adventurism will lead to America's increasing isolation. It is already encountering a firm rebuff from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries now. Even America's allies are already being forced increasingly frequently into collision with their "big brother." The mass antiwar movement is expanding. Sooner or later the combined effect of all these factors will lead to a new alignment of political forces within the United States. That is when a new, fifth period will begin in the development of Soviet-U.S. relations...

Bogdanov Interviewed on Ties

LD161359 Moscow World Service in English 2300 GMT 15 Nov 83

[Dr Radomir Bogdanov, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute, interviewed by Moscow radio correspondent Viktor Yenzikeyev on 50th anniversary of Soviet-American diplomatic relations -- recorded; date and place not specified]

[Text] [Yenzikeyev] Dr Bogdanov, 16 November marks a special anniversary in Soviet-American diplomatic relations. With what feelings do you approach this special date?

[Bogdanov] I tell you frankly, that I approach this special date with very mixed feelings, and there is one reason for that -- the state of the Soviet-American relations (?today), which is very grim. To be frank, there are no Soviet-American relations today; there is only military, ideological and all other kinds of confrontation from the American side. I'm going as far as saying that this administration is -- maybe they have succeeded already -- they are just trying to ruin the whole structure of the Soviet-American relations and instead of that to come over the military and all other kinds of confrontation with the Soviet Union. So that's why I say that my feelings are rather mixed. And many of us, you know, we put a very, very simple but at the same time very (?annoying) question: If the Soviet, normal constructive Soviet-American relations are at all possible. And you have a temptation to say maybe they are doomed to be external confrontations [words indistinct] but it is not true. We have enough historical proofs and we have enough historical experience today that constructive Soviet-American relations are possible, and if they are really constructive, normal, the beneficiary [words indistinct] the whole world, the whole world so my feelings are like that: On one hand, I'm very sorry for the present state of the Soviet-American relations but at the same time, when I come back to the historical experience, I have a kind of, you know, optimistic approach for the future; how distant future I don't know, but in any case for the future, that those relations can be normal and constructive.

[Yenikeyev] Now, Dr Bogdanov, looking back at the history of Soviet-American relations, what were the most successful [words indistinct].

[Bogdanov] You know, Viktor, there is no doubt that all of us will recognize that the most successful, that the most cooperative period was the period of the Second World War, when we were fighting together under the banner of the anti-Hitler coalition against the common enemy, against fascism. We were fighting together, not only spiritually, but we were fighting in the fields of combat, combat fields, you know, and that period shows that the Soviet-American cooperation, though we are very different, we have different societies, we have different systems, it is possible and can be very profitable, not only for both sides but for the whole humanity.

[Yenikeyev] Well, now the assessment of detente and the period in the seventies. Do you think it is also possible, well, to again have normal relations between the two states, in diplomatic and relations in other fields between the two countries?

[Bogdanov] Now, in the United States that period which you call detente is not even fashionable to remind. [as heard]. It's rather fashionable to (call this as) a very bad period in the history of the United States. We have quite a different view for one very simple reason, because we still believe that the Soviet, normal and constructive Soviet-American relations are a real objective necessity for keeping peace in this world, so there is objective necessity, but there is a subjective condition for that, and that is the Soviet policy. I would put it like that: the high potential of the Soviet goodwill to keep normal constructive Soviet-American relations.

[Yenikeyev] Do you mean to say that the Republican administration hasn't learned much from the history of Soviet-American diplomatic relations?

[Bogdanov] You know, we have witnessed different Republican administrations; for instance, if you come back even to Eisenhower's administration. There was a kind of trend to improve Soviet-American relations; it was a kind of understanding that you cannot go along like that (?on the) massive retaliations business forever in the nuclear age. But what strikes me, you know, that this administration which belongs to the Republican, you know, banner, is absolutely something absolutely unknown to, if you like, to normal imagination, because any, any common-sense persons will be really amazed how irresponsible (?is the behavior) of this administration at the nuclear age.

[Yenikeyev] Well, in speaking in general terms, Dr Bogdanov, how much do you think Soviet-American relations -- I mean diplomatic relations -- are dependent about who sits in the White House, the Republicans or the Democrats?

[Bogdanov] You know, I would put it like that: Within the Democratic (?Party and) Republican Party there are different sections. There are (?hard) anti-Soviet, anticommunist sections in both parties. There are realistically-thinking sections, understanding that the whole world has changed. There is a very, very important [words indistinct] in our liking or disliking of both systems doesn't depend on Democrats (?or) Republicans. It depends on people, due to different reasons, coming to power, coming to the White House.

[Yenikeyev] In what terms, in what words, Dr Bogdanov, could you describe the perspective in Soviet-American relations?

[Bogdanov] To be frank, I have no more illusions about this administration and I am sorry to say but I think that these people sitting (?now) in the White House [word indistinct] so much confrontation [words indistinct] anti-Soviet [word indistinct]; there is so much [word indistinct] hatred. Against that one (?sees) the perspective of Soviet-American relations in rather very grim, you know, colors. But at the same time, you know, my hopes lie with the American people lies with the American people because my experience -- and I have been [word indistinct] for the last 25 years -- is that the [word indistinct] and the common sense of the American people will prevail over most dangerous factions, and I believe, and we have hopes of that, that there is a growing understanding in the United States that besides all differences, besides all our difficulties, there is a common danger for two peoples in nuclear war. If there is a nuclear war, there is no problem who is capitalist, who belongs to capitalists, who belongs to socialists. All of us will be in ashes. So I believe in common sense of the American people. That's my hope.

[Venikayev] Dr Bogdanov, 'I thank you for (?the) interview.

REAGAN SENDS MESSAGE ON DIPLOMATIC ANNIVERSARY

LD171214 Moscow TASS in English 1203 GMT 17 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- President Ronald Reagan of the United States has sent a telegram to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The telegram reads:

Fifty years have passed since diplomatic relations were established between our countries. As we note this anniversary, I hope that we can recommit ourselves to working constructively on the problems before us.

The United States has no higher aim nor more urgent goal than achieving and preserving world peace and security.

Let us seek ways, despite the differences in our governments' philosophies and values, to cooperate in reducing international tensions and creating a safer world.

If we can work together to this end, we shall be fulfilling the promise of November 16, 1933, when formal times between our countries began.

GRENADA SHOWS U.S. POLICY'S 'REPULSIVE NATURE'

PM161717 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Nov 83 First Edition p 1

["International Review" by Vadim Zagladin: "Grenada and Missiles" -- **capitalized passages published in boldface**]

[Text] During the recent Moscow meeting between a group of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies and representatives of the FRG Bundestag, some of the West German parliamentarians diligently tried to convince us: "You must not attach such great importance to President R. Reagan's about a 'crusade' against socialism. This is rhetoric more than anything else, while policy is something different...."

The Soviet deputies, relying on the facts, attempted to prove: What kind of rhetoric is this! Reagan's "crusade" is his policy, unrealistic and insane, but implemented with the consistency of a criminally programmed robot. Our interlocutors still shook their heads in doubt.

I think, however, that if our conversation were to take place now, today, it would run a different course. Because now, today, after Grenada, the impression of Washington's policy and America's "image" in general in the eyes not only of Europeans but of the whole world have acquired a truly repulsive nature.

True, President Reagan is now boasting of his crimes. After all, what "heroism" -- to bring down the entire might of the Pentagon's ultramodern military machine on a tiny unarmed island! What "success" -- to fight a whole week against a few hundred Grenadian patriots and Cuban workers armed with light rifles! What a grand "achievement" -- to crush an autonomous country's independence and install your own henchman there!

In actual fact, this "achievement" is fully in line with the general mood of the present White House masters and their policy -- a policy aimed at achieving world hegemony for the United States.

And now we come to the heart of the matter.

The endless chain of events -- some more remarkable, others totally insignificant -- produces events which, like a flash of lightning, illuminate the entire political horizon and cast light on the minutest details which escape notice under ordinary daylight. So with Grenada: The unceremonious and brazen U.S. aggression seemed to bring to light all the disgusting secrets of the Washington political kitchen. Now they can go unnoticed and their essence can be ignored only by those who stubbornly refuse to pay attention to them, or by those who are themselves drunk on chauvinism and militarism. What has the Grenada tragedy demonstrated, what lessons has it taught to mankind?

LESSON ONE. Now the reflection of the flames from Grenadian hospitals and schools burned down by the interventionists makes it completely clear: Mr Reagan's "crusade" is neither rhetoric nor a figurative expression. This is a totally real policy, thoroughly calculated by the Pentagon and CIA "strategists." This is a policy of the export of counter-revolution, a policy of social revenge.

Fanatical anticommunism and unbridled anti-Sovietism, having already served once before in this century as a platform for the preparation of a world war, are once again acquiring this function. The danger of this must be understood by all.

LESSON TWO. The United States and its state leadership have already and on many occasions -- and without the slightest excuse for it -- accused socialism, the socialist community countries, and, along with them, all the fighters for freedom, of terrorism. But now, in the light of the Grenada lightning, it has become obvious with special clarity: It is Washington that has turned terrorism -- mass terrorism with the use of the latest means of warfare, terrorism against entire peoples -- into the fundamental element of its state policy. Grenada, Nicaragua, Lebanon... This list of crimes by modern terrorism can be continued...

LESSON THREE. And in the very same way, how many times has Washington accused the socialist countries of persecuting "dissidents!" It is mendacious and cynical to support those who are struggling against socialism, supply them with money and instructions, turn them into its mercenaries, and afterwards, when justice punishes them for having committed illegal actions, shout about the persecution of "dissidents!"

But if there is someone who really persecutes dissidents -- and not only persecutes them, but actually strives by fire and sword to destroy people who think in a different or opposite way to Washington -- it is the U.S. authorities. Something else can be said: The entire U.S. strategy is a strategy of struggle not for life but for death of the dissidents. It is no accident that the directives for the U.S. Armed Forces for 1984-1988 read: Their goal is to destroy the socialist social system as such.

LESSON FOUR. This is not the first time the peoples in the world have noticed: The U.S. Administration is capable of unexpected aggressive actions, prepared in secret and executed suddenly. Washington is capable of suddenly switching from bombastic declarations about peace to the stepping up of tension and the sharp acceleration of the arms race.

In light of the events in Grenada, the unpredictability of the incumbent U.S. Administration's actions and the adventurism of its political principles and its political practice become especially evident. Conclusions from this must be drawn by everyone, including Washington's allies, who in essence find themselves more and more frequently on the receiving end of this practice of faits accomplis.

LESSON FIVE. The present U.S. policy does not just fail to generate trust in itself. It actually gives rise to the deepest mistrust. And this applies not only to the intentions expressed by its makers; their falsity, their profound mendacity are exposed by facts literally every day. This mistrust is now justifiedly spreading (under one form or another all over the world) to any obligations undertaken by Washington, ranging from commercial contracts to international treaties signed by it.

The only "principles" of U.S. policy which are being truly consistently implemented and which are thus worthy of trust (if this very unsuitable word were to be used) are hegemonism, striving for military superiority, and readiness to resolve any problems by the use of force.

The bloodbath organized by the United States in Grenada is, in other words, a serious warning to all peoples and all countries. This is evidence of the fact that the "era of the offensive by conservatism," proclaimed by President Reagan on 3 October in his speech at the Heritage Foundation, is nothing but a challenge to all mankind. The threat of the Grenadian scenario being repeated is a threat to all progressive countries, to any democratic regime, to any state not agreeing to put its head on the American block. Grenada sounds a warning that rings out all over our planet.

...All over our planet -- and of course over the European Continent. It is, after all, this part of the planet that has now become the nerve center of the world situation. The continent where world wars have been twice already unleashed through the efforts of German militarism is now in danger of becoming the hotbed of a third such war. But this time the force preparing the catastrophe is U.S. imperialism. This time the town criers of the "crusade" against socialism are armed with nuclear facilities. The deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles on European soil could become a dangerous stage along the road to the abyss.

This is because these are missiles meant for a first, "disabling" strike against the socialist countries. This is because these are weapons with whose help people intend to carry out aggression "with impunity" and attain the unthinkable -- victory in a nuclear war. This is because these are, to put it in other words, special tools of Washington's adventurous policy.

The FRG leaders are declaring: They do not wish a war to start again from German soil. We would like to believe them. But, you see, the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles on that very soil CAN, AND IS CAPABLE OF turning that soil into the very first bridgehead of a nuclear conflict. And -- remember Grenada! -- this can occur not only against Bonn's will but even unexpectedly for it. In exactly the same way as the United States, without saying a word to its allies, attacked the small defenseless island, it can secretly take the criminal decision and unexpectedly turn the key and launch the nuclear death....

The deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe is yet another example of the adventurism of U.S. policy. At the same time it is yet another demonstration of its treachery as regards U.S. allies. Nuclear blackmail on the socialist countries is organically (and quite logically) combined with pressure on West European countries. The calculations here are obvious: Hitch these countries even more firmly to the American military chariot and thus get hold of a new -- and even more effective! -- lever for putting pressure on their policies. It may be that people in Bonn, London, and Rome have not yet given any thought to this (or are pretending not to have given it any thought?) To no purpose! When the sharp spurs of the American rider hit at full force the flanks of the European horse, it will already be too late to think....

....Since 1917, since Great October, Washington has not abandoned its attempts to "cast socialism onto the ash heap of history." For the first 16 years of our state's existence it utterly refused to recognize it as a political reality. Only in 1933 -- just 50 years ago -- did insight come. The United States established diplomatic relations with our country. Then, 8 years later, the United States and the USSR became allies in the war against fascism.

Then various stages, various periods, ensued in our relations. But now, today, realism has evidently been forbidden entry to the White House. The place of a sober consideration of the real circumstances has been usurped there by the line defined by the ego-centric formula "I take what I want." Hence Grenada. Hence the missiles in Europe. Hence the shameless anti-Sovietism. But this approach leads in only one direction: to catastrophe.

Is another approach possible? Is a shift in Washington's policy, is a return to realism possible? Above all I think that this shift is simply essential. It is essential to the whole world. It is essential also to the United States itself. And, of course, there are politicians there too who realize this, who understand that the world today, which has changed so radically and is continuing to change, is a political arena totally unsuited to adventurism, and that the present correlations of forces in this arena is such that the course toward military confrontation is fraught only with bitter and perhaps tragic setbacks for its supporters and inspirers.

"The release of the material resources that are being senselessly squandered on the arms race, the revelation of man's inexhaustible creative potential -- that is what can unite people, that is what should determine the policy of states in the late 20th and early 21st centuries," Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov has said. And this is not an abstract formula. It is a conclusion drawn from the entire history of our tempestuous century. The names of those who now advocate this approach toward world affairs are legion. It is this approach which our country is seeking to implement in practice. Our gamble is a gamble on realism. It is a gamble on reason. It is a gamble on life. And we are sure that it is the only correct gamble.

WEEKLY HINTS ROK LEADER KNEW OF BLAST IN ADVANCE

PM151803 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 45, Nov 1983 p 17

[V. Godyna article: "Merciful Heaven?"]

[Text] "A provocation tantamount to a declaration of war." "A despicable incident." "A gross and serious provocation." South Korean dictator Chon Tu-hwan was furious. He put all the oratory at his command into his speech on South Korea television. "The perpetrators of this action were North Korean Communists," he thundered.

It may be recalled that a powerful explosion occurred during the wreath-laying ceremony at the mausoleum of Aung San, Burma's national hero, in Rangoon on October 9. As a result of this terrorist act, four South Korean ministers and 11 other high-ranking officials lost their lives. The tragedy occurred a few minutes before the arrival of Chon Tu-hwan himself at the mausoleum.

Echoing its supreme censor ("I escaped death by a miracle"), the South Korean press began to talk about his "miraculous escape" and well-nigh divine intervention. But there are details which attracted the attention of some newspapers in South-East Asia and which lead to thoughts far removed from the supernatural.

DETAIL ONE. The day and hour of the visit to the Aung San mausoleum were decided jointly by the Burmese and the South Koreans. But Chon Tu-hwan himself changed the day of the wreath-laying ceremony. More. He sent Yi Kye-chol, the South Korean ambassador to Burma, in his place. The trip was arranged (the car, escort and other "signs") to make it appear as though dictator Chon himself was in the car. Does this not suggest that Chon Tu-hwan knew in advance that there would be an explosion?

DETAIL TWO: New appointments were announced in Seoul literally a few hours after the resignation of the previous Cabinet. The change of scenery was effected so fast that it caused one to wonder whether the dictator had not known beforehand about the need for a "reorganization."

DETAIL THREE. The changes made by Chon Tu-hwan affected 26 posts in the Seoul corridors of power. He removed the premier and many of his own assistants but -- strangely enough -- did not touch the director of the National Security Agency or the chief of his bodyguard both of whom had been more at fault than anybody else for what happened in the Burmese capital and, logically, should have been the first to answer for it. What had they done to retain their posts?

If these details were integrated, the principal question would be: Was not the South Korean dictator himself involved in the explosion, hoping to kill two birds with one stone -- remove the associates he considered unsuitable and whip up an anti-communist hysteria?

DPRK 'STRONGLY CONDEMNS' REAGAN'S S. KOREAN VISIT

LD161358 Moscow TASS in English 1331 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Pyongyang November 16 TASS -- The Government and people of the Korean People's Democratic Republic (KPDR) strongly condemn Reagan's trip to South Korea.

The trip was a criminal action which imperils peace in Korea, Asia, and throughout the world and is a challenge to the people of Korea and to all the peace forces of the world, emphasizes a statement issued by the KPDR's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The statement has been circulated here.

The aim of the provocative visit was to consolidate U.S. domination in South Korea, to enhance the Washington-Seoul-Tokyo military alliance, and to realize U.S. imperialism's aggressive strategy in Asia, the strategy which envisages a blockade of and an attack on socialist countries.

Reagan tried to bind South Korea and Japan still more closely to the U.S. bellicose course and to consolidate positions in Asia, thereby gaining political capital for the forthcoming presidential elections. The head of the U.S. Administration went to the lengths of direct threats to use nuclear weapons against the KPDR, the statement stresses.

The large-scale build-up of the armed forces by the USA and the South Korean regime is the cause of the present tension in Korea, the tension which has grown still more after Reagan's trip. They flagrantly violate the armistice agreement, making provocative sallies against the KPDR. For the sake of easing tension and ensuring peace in the region, it is necessary, as is suggested by the Government of the KPDR, that U.S. troops be withdrawn from South Korea and that the armistice agreement be replaced by a peace agreement.

Reagan's trip to the countries of the Far East has again shown the U.S. ruling circles' adherence to the aggressive militarist foreign policy. Washington, upon having made the overt armed attack on Grenada recently, haughtily states preparedness to repeat the action in any other part of the globe in an attempt to force mankind to live in an atmosphere of military alarm.

The Government of the KPDR and the Korean people do not want a war and will make every effort for the defence of peace in Korea and for its independent peaceful reunification with the active support and solidarity of all the peace-loving progressive forces of the world, the statement emphasizes.

S. KOREAN STUDENTS ARRESTED IN CLASHES

SK170038 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1330 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Recently, the Seoul police authorities arrested some 170 activists of student organizations who demanded the withdrawal of the U.S. aggressor forces from South Korea and the immediate resignation of dictator Chon Tu-hwan. Some 29 leaders of the anti-U.S. movement were arrested in Seoul even during U.S. President Reagan's visit.

Serious clashes took place between the police and student demonstrators in 11 South Korean colleges during the last 6 days.

ROMANIA CALLS ON EUROPE, U.S. TO DEFER DEPLOYMENT

LD162129 Moscow TASS in English 2051 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Bucharest November 16 TASS -- The eighth session of the Grand National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Romania opened here today.

The deputies of the supreme legislative body of Socialist Romania discussed and unanimously approved the appeal of the Grand National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Romania to the parliaments and parliamentarians of the European states, the United States and Canada. The appeal stresses the need of attaining an accord at the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva, the accord that would lead to renunciation of deployment of new nuclear missiles in Europe and deliverance of Europe from any types of nuclear weapons.

In the document it is noted that the proposals, which were formulated in Yuriy Andropov's answers to the newspaper PRAVDA of October 27 this year showed that there is a possibility of attaining a relevant agreement. If such an agreement is not reached, the Grand National Assembly calls upon the parliaments of the European states, the United States and Canada to work for deferment of deployment of new medium-range missiles, to act with the utmost responsibility for the sake of the present and the future of the European Continent and the whole world, to press that the governments of the countries where new missiles are planned to be deployed should renounce their deployment on their territories. The time has come, the document stresses, when it is necessary to redouble the efforts for attaining a fair agreement that would deliver our continent, all the international community from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

A speech at the session was made by General Secretary of the Romanian Communist Party, President of the Socialist Republic of Romania Nicolae Ceausescu. He expressed confidence that the peoples can put an end to the policy which leads to a nuclear catastrophe, that they can ensure disarmament and peace.

SOVIET-HUNGARIAN COMMISSION MEETS IN YEREVAN

Talks Begin

GF141558 Yerevan SOVETAKAN AYASTAN in Armenian 11 Oct 83 p 2

[Excerpts] The necessity of generalizing standards and the similarity of problems encountered in carrying out socialist construction in the current stage has promoted comprehensive scientific, technical and ideological cooperation by the fraternal socialist countries and the constant development of socialist changes and scientific potential and principles. The fifth session of the Soviet-Hungarian commission for cooperation in sciences, which began on 10 October in Yerevan, is being held to examine basic problems.

The session was participated in by famous Soviet and Hungarian social workers, economists, philosophers, sociologists, lawyers, historians, and literary figures. It was opened by P.N. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Academician V.A. Ambartsumyan, president of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences, warmly greeted the participants.

P.M. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, addressed the session on the tasks of the sciences in light of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee resolutions.

He said that the current session of the Soviet-Hungarian commission for cooperation in sciences was being held during a period when the whole party and all the Soviet peoples, including scientists, are restructuring their work in response to the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

It was noted at the plenum that ideological work is in the forefront and its role and significance continues to grow.

He said that the sciences play an important role in the socioeconomic development of the Soviet peoples. He noted the significance of new scientific and technical discoveries, which are to secure rapid work productivity, to wisely use the country's scientific and technical potential in production, and to promote a rational approach in production and in public and personal consumption.

He said: In that regard our session must analyze the course of implementing the 5-year plan for cooperation between the Hungarian and Soviet academies of sciences, review individually the various projects, and outline the paths for future scientific and organizational cooperation.

Then Z.P. Pach, vice president of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, addressed the session.

He said: The important developments in the USSR, the most progressive country of the socialist community, have great influence on the other fraternal countries. We find that Marxist ideology, the critical frankness and honesty in which the June plenum and Comrade Yu.V. Andropov analyzed the achievements and problems of the entire century while outlining the party's new targets, are guidelines not only for the Soviet Union, but also for the other socialist countries, including Hungary, and the entire international revolutionary movement.

Reports were heard at the session on the cooperation between Hungarian and Armenian social scientists and the work of the Soviet-Hungarian historians commission. Addresses were also made by Soviet and Hungarian economists on generalizing the new experiment of Soviet and Hungarian development.

The session's opening was attended by K.L. Dallakyan, secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, and Y.Y. Khodzhamiryan, deputy chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers.

The session will continue its work.

Session Ends

GF150500 Yerevan SOVETAKAN AYASTAN in Armenian 15 Oct 83 p 2

[Excerpts] On 13 October, the Soviet-Hungarian commission for cooperation in social sciences, concluded its fifth scientific session in Yerevan.

The speeches and reports at the session noted the principled importance of the 1983 plenums of the CPSU and the Hungarian Socialist Party Central Committees and the decisions of the fraternal parties in recent years on the radical restructuring of social sciences and more important and different directions for their future development.

A document of true Soviet-Hungarian cooperation in social sciences was signed.

The two sides affirmed that the major part of the agreed plans are being basically fulfilled. Satisfaction was expressed at the successful start of a number of plans which have been fully integrated into the main plans in accordance with the recommendations of the fourth session of the commission. Among those are the specialization and cooperation means between CEMA countries in agro-industrial complexes, the study of Soviet and Hungarian progressive philosophical traditions, and Hungarian-Marxist philosophy in the USSR.

Issues dealing with all theoretical problems of socialist development, the economic problems of socialist and communist construction, social, political and cultural development of socialism, the research of world revolutionary movements and international relations, were outlined in the document as more important and practical problems.

DEMICHEV RECEIVES HUNGARIAN FRONT DELEGATION

LD161814 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1614 GMT 16 Nov 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of culture, today received a delegation from the Patriotic People's Front [PPF] of the Hungarian People's Republic headed by Imre Pozsgay, member of the MSZMP Central Committee and secretary general of the Hungarian PPF Council. The conversation took place in a warm and comradely atmosphere.

KUZNETSOV PRESENTS AWARD TO HUNGARIAN OFFICIAL

LD162229 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Comrade Kuznetsov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, today in the Kremlin presented the Order of Friendship of Peoples to Andras Gyenes, chairman of the Central Control Commission of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party. Comrade Kuznetsov noted that Gyenes has had this high award conferred upon him for his great contribution to the development and strengthening of friendship and cooperation between the Hungarian People's Republic and the Soviet Union.

RYABOV SURVEYS ECONOMIC TIES WITH HUNGARY

PM101506 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 45 Oct 83 (Signed to Press 31 Oct 83) p 21

[Article by Ya. P. Ryabov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations: "Energy of Creation"; carried under rubric "CEMA: Integration in Action"]

[Text] The 37th CEMA session sitting, held in October 1983 in Berlin, once again demonstrated the member countries' firm determination to consistently implement the strategy of developing and deepening socialist economic integration elaborated by the fraternal communist and workers parties.

The session participants noted that the orientation in our countries' cooperation toward resolving the most major problems of paramount significance for the development of the national economy and its provision with material resources has increased. Large-scale agreements aimed at accelerating scientific and technical progress are being implemented. Joint work is being carried out to create a number of efficient machines and equipment and progressive industrial processes and to assimilate nontraditional energy sources.

Close Cooperation

In the CEMA member countries the development of the nuclear power industry is the main direction in assimilating nontraditional energy sources, as laid down by the long-term targeted program for cooperation in the sphere of energy, fuel, and raw materials. By 1982 the capacity of AESes in the CEMA countries was in excess of 22 million KW and they generated 123 billion KW-hours, which is around 7 percent of all the electricity produced in the community countries.

As the first to start assimilating the nuclear power industry, the USSR is assisting on an increasingly large scale its assimilation in the fraternal socialist countries on a bilateral basis and is actively taking part in multilateral cooperation aimed at the further development of the nuclear power industry. AESes built with the Soviet Union's assistance in Bulgaria, the GDR, and Czechoslovakia have been operating reliably and without problems for a long time now. In the CEMA countries, excluding the USSR, 36 AES power units with an overall capacity of around 23 million KW are at the agreement, design, or construction stage.

Recently the fifth country in the socialist community to produce nuclear power independently emerged -- Hungary. The first power unit of the Hungarian Paks AES was commissioned and since its operational startup has already produced around 2 billion KW-hours of electricity. This power unit is the first not just for Hungary but also the first in the community of socialist states for which equipment was delivered within the framework of the 1979 multilateral agreement signed by the fraternal countries on international specialization and sharing in the production of AES equipment in the period through 1990.

All the CEMA countries specializing, according to the above-mentioned agreement, in the manufacture of various equipment for AESes are participating in deliveries of equipment for the Hungarian AES. Thus the CSSR delivers to the Paks AES complete reactor plants, pressurizers, and other equipment; Poland delivers specialized heat exchange equipment; the GDR delivers transportation and technological equipment; and Bulgaria delivers shielding equipment. Hungarian organizations themselves manufacture recharging machines, generators with a 220-MW capacity, specialized water purification equipment, transportation and technological equipment, and other auxiliary equipment. Hungary delivers several types of this equipment for the AESes under construction in other CEMA member countries, including the Soviet Union.

Paks today is yet another symbol of the constructive cooperation between the fraternal socialist countries in the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, which began with the first AESes in the USSR and the nuclear-powered ship "Lenin." It is profoundly symbolic that the ceremonial commissioning of the first Paks power unit is timed to coincide with the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution's 66th anniversary.

The construction of the Paks AES continues successfully. The bulk of the installation work on the second power unit is already completed, and preparations are in progress for the startup and adjustment operations. Work has begun on the construction of the Paks AESes second stage (third and fourth power units). When all 4 power units are operational, the capacity of the AESes 4 power units will be 1.76 million KW, or about 25 percent of the country's present power-generating capacity. When the power station has reached full capacity it will enable Hungary to effect a progressive transformation in the structure of the country's fuel and energy balance. As a clearer illustration of this, I would note that by as early as 1985 the Paks AES will have saved 1.5 million metric tons of petroleum.

Equal Partners

Relations with Hungary occupy a prominent position in the USSR's economic relations with socialist countries. The first agreement on technical assistance by the Soviet Union to Hungary was signed in January 1952. In the more than 30 years since then Hungary has, with the cooperation of Soviet organizations, built or reconstructed over 100 different national economic projects and individual shops and installations.

The volume of Soviet exports of complete equipment packages to Hungary has increased over 13 times in the last 20 years. Capacities created in the country with the USSR's assistance at present produce, for example, 2.3 million metric tons of steel, 850,000 metric tons of cast iron, 1.2 million metric tons of not-rolled sheet steel, 250,000 metric tons of alumina, about 200,000 metric tons of nitric fertilizers, and 10 million square meters of sheet glass each year. Equipment delivered from the USSR is used to refine over 80 percent of petroleum and natural gas in the country.

The Danube Metallurgical Combine, whose expansion and modernization is currently in progress with the participation of Soviet organizations, was the first project born of Soviet-Hungarian economic cooperation. Having started with the production of cold- and hot-rolled sheet steel, the combine now produces curved steel sections, spiral-weld tubes, light metal sections, and other products. The combine's output was used during the construction of the Druzhba oil pipeline, the Soyuz gas pipeline, and the 750-kilovolt Vinnitsa-Albertirsa power transmission line. The rolled sheet metal produced by the combine supplies the requirements of Hungarian machine building, including the plants producing the world-famous Ikarusz buses.

In 1982 the combine produced 1.3 million metric tons of steel, in other words 1 out of every 3 metric tons produced in Hungary. A second 130-metric-ton converter was brought into operation in June 1982, marking the completion of the construction, with the participation of Soviet organizations, of an oxygen-conversion shop with an annual capacity of over 1 million metric tons of Bessemer steel. Construction work is currently continuing on a coking battery with an annual capacity of 1 million metric tons of coke, and when it is brought into operation at the end of the current 5-year plan this will enable the country to significantly reduce its coke imports.

Soviet-Hungarian cooperation has developed significantly in the petroleum-refining industry, whose raw material is provided by petroleum delivered from the USSR. About 7.5 million metric tons of petroleum are processed each year by Soviet equipment operating at the Danube and Tisza Petroleum Refineries, built with our assistance. The wide range of petroleum products produced by these plants provides a good base for the chemical industry and fertilizer production.

Cooperation with the Soviet Union is highly significant for Hungary in the development of its chemical industry, construction industry, machine building, aluminum industry, agriculture, and other sectors of the economy.

In addition to nuclear power engineering, the Soviet Union is also helping in other areas to resolve the energy problem in Hungary. At the present stage, for example, the production of heat and electric power using the local lignite is an important and economically advantageous energy source under Hungarian conditions. The solution of this task will largely depend on the rate of increase in coal extraction. Soviet and Hungarian organizations are continuing their cooperation in the current 5-year plan in the construction of mines.

Two of the four new mines planned for construction near the city of Tatabanya have already been commissioned. When all four mines are completed, they will have a total capacity of over 8 million metric tons of coal a year.

A large role in solving the socialist countries' energy problem is also to be played by interstate electric power transmission lines. One of them is the 750-kilovolt Vinnitsa-Albertirsa power transmission line, which has been in operation since 1979 and enables Hungary to import from the USSR 7.5 billion kw-hours of electricity a year.

Mutual Advantage

The jointly created cooperation projects deepen the economic cooperation between the two countries and enhance its mutual economic advantage. In particular, our country presently imports from cooperation projects in Hungary alumina and aluminum sections, bearings, and other products.

Hungarian organizations have cooperated in the Soviet Union in the construction and commissioning of modern enterprises for the food and paint and varnish industries, and in the current modernization of the Likino Bus Plant, a number of light and food industry enterprises, and furniture factories. Major agricultural projects are also under construction, among them a hog-breeding complex in Georgia and a poultry factory in Azerbaijan. In addition, it is well known that the Hungarian side plays an active part in constructing a number of integration projects on Soviet territory.

The Soviet-Hungarian summit talks held in Moscow in July 1983 gave a new boost to the further development and deepening of the comprehensive fraternal relations between the USSR and Hungary, which fully correspond with our peoples' interests. "We are confident," Yu.V. Andropov noted in his speech when presenting Comrade J. Kadar with the Order of Lenin, "that these relations and the close cooperation between our parties will continue to develop for the benefit of the Soviet and Hungarian peoples, in the interests of socialism and peace."

ZAMYATIN, CHERVOV MEET WITH NETHERLANDS MP'S

LD161612 Moscow TASS in English 1510 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] The Hague November 16 TASS -- A meeting took place in the Dutch Parliament between members of the Foreign Relations Commission of the Parliament's Second Chamber as well as representatives of the Defense Commission and Leonid Zamyatin, member of the Foreign Relations Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Colonel-General Nikolay Chervov, head of a directorate at the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces.

Pressing international problems, first of all those connected with nuclear arms limitations in Europe, were touched upon during the conversation.

The Soviet visitors drew the attention of the Dutch MP's to Yuriy Andropov's statement and his replies to questions asked by the newspaper PRAVDA and pointed out the constructive position assumed by the Soviet Union at the Geneva talks with a view to reaching agreement on substantially scaling down nuclear confrontation in Europe. Leonid Zamyatin and Nikolay Chervov answered numerous questions put by the Dutch MP's.

Leonid Zamyatin and Nikolay Chervov were received by Dirk Dolman, chairman of the Second Chamber of the Parliament of the Netherlands, and had a conversation with him, in which Viktor Beletskiy, Soviet ambassador to the Netherlands, also took part.

Zamyatin Addresses Parliament

LD161732 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 16 Nov 83

["Statement by Leonid Zamyatin" -- TASS headline]

[Text] The Hague November 16 TASS -- "The appearance in Europe of new U.S. nuclear missiles will not add more security to our continent. The continent's strategic stability, as well as the existing military balance between East and West will be put in jeopardy", said Leonid Zamyatin, member of the Foreign Relations Commission of the Council of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Speaking in the Parliament of the Netherlands today, he said that an even heavier burden of a new spiral of the arms race will be placed on Europe. Moreover, the situation may become critical, even explosive.

Europe, Leonid Zamyatin went on to say, is now at a cross-roads. One road was mapped out in Helsinki and recently endorsed in Madrid. It leads to a greater security and a lesser military confrontation. It broadens the possibilities for cooperation, and reduces the military confrontation of the blocs. The other road is to be marked by missiles. And this leads to impairing stability and security, to undermining the military parity, and so to risk and unpredictable consequences.

Further on, Leonid Zamyatin reminded that over the two years of talks in Geneva the USSR tabled one proposal after another and in many cases initiated a number of unilateral measures. "At the talks we were and are guided by the spirit of compromise, displaying flexibility -- genuine, not pretended. But there is, of course, a limit to unilateral decisions we cannot go beyond without creating a risk to our security and that of our allies. The Soviet Union has done everything that depended on it at the talks in Geneva, with a view to achieving positive results. But the other side, too, must also cover its road toward a compromise.

In the meantime, Leonid Zamyatin said, the American side strove to turn the talks not into the discussion of how many weapons will be cut, according to the subject of the talks on nuclear arms limitations in Europe, but rather into haggling about how many U.S. missiles will be deployed. This position has remained unchanged to this very day. The U.S. Administration, Leonid Zamyatin continued, stubbornly insists on its own: to reach a military superiority over the USSR through deployment of new missiles.

Speaking about the unacceptability of the U.S. position, Leonid Zamyatin said the USA wants to exclude from the subject of the talks its forward-based nuclear means which have long been in existence and include hundreds of medium-range aircraft. They propose, he further said, that we "take no notice" of the missiles-nuclear means of France and Great Britain, although no one has ever denied the fact that those missiles are trained on us. Speaking in images, the situation as it emerges is like that of a duel in which one rival is being aimed at both by his adversary and his two seconds. He is told, however, not to pay any attention to this since the seconds are not officially participants in the duel.

"Insistence on two demands -- not to take into account the U.S. forward-based means and not to take into account the nuclear arms of Britain and France -- has deadlocked the talks", Leonid Zamyatin stressed. Should the "Persings" be deployed in Western Europe, he said, the talks in Geneva will lose sense.

With the appearance of the first U.S. missiles on the European soil, Leonid Zamyatin pointed out, a qualitatively new situation is developing. "A situation which will require counter-measures both on the side of the USSR, and on the side of the Warsaw Treaty. Counter-measures both in relation to the USA, and in relation to its allies. A situation which will require pondering over what can and must be done further to avoid the worst. I wish to say that we do not intend to drive wedges between the overseas and European NATO members. But we resolutely object to the current U.S. policy placing the future of Europe in jeopardy".

THATCHER 'PRETENDING' TO FORGET ANDROPOV WARNING

LD162209 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 16 Nov 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Boris Kalyagin]

[Excerpts] In Britain the wave of protests is growing against the appearance of the first American cruise missiles on British territory.

A hot welcome was arranged for Heseltine, British secretary of state for defense, by the students of Manchester University. They threw rotten tomatoes and paint at him. Heseltine had arrived to speak at the university at the invitation of the local organization of conservative students. However, he only managed to make his way into the hall with great difficulty and under the reinforced protection of the police. The secretary of state for defense spent almost an hour cleaning his suit and washing off the paint, but he could not wash off the shame of the decision, made by the Conservatives, on the deployment of the U.S. missiles.

As Ruddock, the chairman of the British campaign for nuclear disarmament, stated, the British Government has put the fate of Britain into the hands of Reagan. Washington already only grudgingly takes into account the opinion of its British partner.

Judging by all appearances, the delivery of cruise missiles to Greenham Common even took the Conservative leadership by surprise.

In order to announce the arrival of the missiles, Heseltine had to interrupt his visit to one of the troop units and set out urgently for Parliament. At the moment of such an important announcement Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was absent. The British are particularly indignant that the Pentagon made haste to deliver its missiles even earlier than the deadline established by NATO, while the Soviet-American talks in Geneva are still continuing. Labor leaders have stressed that this is leading to the breakdown of the talks.

Margaret Thatcher found herself in a rather awkward situation, attempting to assure the public that, in the event of progress in Geneva, it will be possible to send back the missiles at once. She argued that the arrival of cruise missiles in Britain does not mean a rejection of the search for ways to conclude an agreement on the limitation of nuclear weapons. The British prime minister is pretending that she does not remember the warning made by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov that the deployment in Western Europe of the new U.S. missiles would make impossible the continuation of the talks which are now being held in Geneva.

UK GOVERNMENT 'INTENDS TO IGNORE' PROTESTS

LD162142 Moscow TASS in English 2044 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] London November 16 TASS -- The British Conservative Government intends to ignore the demands of the majority of Britons to stop deploying American missiles on British territory. As was stated on radio by Defence Secretary of the country Michael Heseltine, no demonstrations will be able to shake the determination to deploy cruise missiles.

The minister's speech was caused by an outburst of mass protests that followed reports on arrival of the first batch of cruise missiles to the U.S. air base in Greenham Common. More than 450 people were arrested in the course of actions of protest on Tuesday alone.

IZVESTIYA VIEWS STATE OF UK-USSR RELATIONS

PM151323 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent V. Skosyrev: "Fall of Anxieties and Hopes"]

[Text] London -- The late fall weather in London has been unusually fine. You look at the bright patches of sunlight reflected in the ponds of Regent's Park, you walk over the lush grass without a tinge of yellow, and you can't help recalling the trite newspaper ploy of drawing a connection between the weather and forecasts in political life.

Alas, in this case the analogy does not work. There is no way you can call the atmosphere in the country relaxed. My journalist friends and indeed the neighbors I meet in the yard are asking: What will happen after the United States has deployed its missiles on British soil? What does the future hold for Britain? A sense of the threat which the U.S. Tomahawks bring with them has taken deep root in the British people's consciousness.

The military invasion of Grenada has dispelled illusions. Those who yesterday were still inclined to take seriously U.S. President R. Reagan's statement regarding the "special confidence" of Anglo-U.S. relations have found out the real worth of the Washington politicians' words.

"How can you give the Americans the right to press the button to launch U.S. missiles from British territory when Washington took no account of Britain's opinion in deciding the fate of a Commonwealth country?"

"To hope that the United States will consult us in the event of war is to fool ourselves," former Conservative Government Minister E. Powell says.

The prospect of becoming the Pentagon's nuclear hostages is being discussed at meetings convened by peace champions and left-wing parties and doctors, war veterans, and scientists as sounding the alarm. A number of eminent politicians who can in no way be suspected of sympathizing with the socialist world are urging the government to renounce its unconditional alignment with Washington and to attempt to make its own contribution to achieving an accord between East and West.

We shall cite just two examples: Returning from a trip to Moscow, former Prime Minister J. Callaghan wrote an article stating: "As for relations between our country and the Soviet Union, the British Government should be far more vigorous in its diplomacy." Criticizing the Tories for cleaving to anti-Soviet rhetoric, the author writes that in the modern world, so full of dangers, a less simplistic approach should be developed the "East-West" problem. In Callaghan's opinion Britain has harmed its own prestige by avoiding, unlike the FRG and France, summit talks with the Soviet Union.

G. Walden, a member of Parliament belonging to the ruling party, has also expressed himself in favor of the restoration -- and the immediate restoration at that -- of Britain's role as a power taking an active part in the West's dialogue with the socialist states.

It cannot be said that Whitehall is totally heedless of critical voices. Recently the speeches of the head of government and leading ministers have begun to contain more frequent admissions of the indisputable fact that there is simply no alternative to peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union. From this the conclusion is drawn that the British side "must be prepared to talk with the Soviet leadership." But does that mean that positive elements have appeared in the British positions? Observer G. Smith, who devoted an article to the subject in THE TIMES, writes that it is merely a case of new nuances in British policy, not of any substantial changes.

Today London's desire to revive Anglo-Soviet contacts is truly manifested only in the sphere of trade and economic relations. Here too, the determining influence is being exerted on Whitehall by business circles, which can clearly see the Soviet market's potential and promise.

...London's City University is located alongside the multistory box-shaped buildings of banks, exchanges, and insurance and industrial companies, that is, the institutions without which the "square mile of money" could not exist. As in any other higher educational establishment, in the intervals between classes the university corridors ring with the loud voices of young people. But in late October the "New Hall," one of the university's biggest lecture halls, was filled with an unusual audience. The owners of small firms, captains of business holding eminent posts in the confederation of British industry, and employees of our own foreign trade organizations met there for a conference devoted to trade with the USSR.

The organizers of the forum emphasized that it was designed to draw the attention primarily of medium and small businessmen. Why was emphasis placed on them? It is worth recalling that back in the late sixties Britain was one of the USSR's leading trading partners in the West. Trade turnover continued to grow in the seventies, especially after Prime Minister H. Wilson's visit to Moscow. It was then that the promising form of cooperation that deals on a compensation basis was developed. However, cooperation declined subsequently. Britain has slipped to ninth place in trade with the East, relegated to the same "league" as small states like Belgium and the Netherlands.

J. Cooper, chairman of the USSR Department of the London Chamber of Commerce and Industry, sees one of the reasons for Britain's lag behind its competitors in the fact that economic relations with the Soviet Union rest mainly with large firms. And small enterprises are poorly informed of the Soviet market potential. "There are few countries in the world which fulfill their commitments as scrupulously and punctiliously as the Soviet Union. Soviet partners are reliable partners," Cooper said. "So our task is to notify 'novices' of the facts and to involve them in cooperation with the USSR."

During a recent working visit to the British Isles by L.A. Kostandov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, British Cabinet members confirmed their desire to develop trade and economic ties with our country. During talks with leaders of ICI, Courtaulds, and other firms, specific spheres for expanding cooperation were outlined.

At the same time we cannot keep silent about the artificial obstacles which are still impeding it. Guided by NATO and EEC directives, Britain has imposed restrictions on trade in a number of commodities. Here is a characteristic example: This year the USSR may export here only 17 pianos and 9 tractors. It is clear that these restrictions undermine the very idea of equal partnership.

Nonetheless business circles here believe the Soviet-British cooperation has a promising future. I recently talked with N. Wooding, deputy chairman of Courtaulds. This firm ranks first in Britain and has a leading place in the capitalist world for the production of synthetic fibers and textiles. The volume of its operations can be judged by the following figure: Last year Courtaulds bought and sold goods to the value of 2 billion pounds sterling.

Glancing out of the window at the square below, filled with a stream of humanity at the end of the working day, Mr Wooding recalled his first trip to Moscow, his first contacts with Soviet partners. Some 20 years have elapsed since then, and the company's ties with our country have become stable and varied. Acrylic and viscose fibers, dyes, packaging materials -- these are just some of the goods from the long list of items supplied to our country. Plants in Korovakan, Kaunas, Novopolotsk, and other cities work with Courtaulds equipment. This cooperation is in no way reminiscent of a one-way street: In turn Courtaulds buys chemicals and other goods in our country.

"What is the secret of your success on the Soviet market?"

"I think first of all the fact that we study it constantly, find out its needs, and offer our partners new types of output and technology. Of course, in no way can we be satisfied with the overall level of trade between Britain and the USSR. It must be pulled out of its state of stagnation; there are great reserves for growth here.

"It scarcely bears mentioning that our relations with our client are built on a commercial basis. In brief, they are mutually advantageous," my interlocutor said in conclusion. "But I should like to stress another aspect of the matter. In our perturbing age economic cooperation is a channel by which contacts between states are constantly maintained. Trade helps to smooth out differences. That is why Courtaulds attaches such very great importance to ties with the Soviet Union."

Mr Wooding's opinion is wholly shared by the leaders of other large corporations who spoke at the City University conference. And you will agree that the viewpoint of big business remains an important factor in London.

ITALIAN DEPUTIES ENDORSE MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

LD162356 Moscow TASS in English 2322 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Rome November 17 TASS -- The Chamber of Deputies of the Italian Parliament has completed debate on the question of the new U.S. medium-range nuclear missile weapons in Europe. The urgent holding of the debate was demanded by representatives of the left opposition parties and broad segments of democratic public profoundly concerned over the militarist plans of the NATO and U.S. military and over the upcoming emplacement of 112 U.S. cruise missiles in Sicily.

The five-party cabinet, headed by the socialist B. Craxi, enjoying the support of a majority in Parliament, was able to obtain approval of its position on this problem. The resolution tabled by the ruling parties, endorsing Italy's previous commitments within NATO's framework to deploy U.S. missiles within the time scheduled, was passed by 351 votes in favour, with 219 deputies voting against, including those from the Communist Party.

PRAVDA REVIEWS RECENT CYPRUS DEVELOPMENTS

PM161845 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS roundup: "Events on Cyprus"]

[Text] Beirut, 16 Nov -- According to news agency reports, the leadership of the Turkish Cypriot community has decided to declare the independence of the part of the island inhabited by the Turkish population.

As is known, following the July 1974 CIA-inspired reactionary coup on Cyprus and subsequent events, the island was in effect partitioned. Talks between representatives of the Greek and Turkish communities on settling the Cyprus problem did not lead to positive results and were broken off.

Nicosia, 16 Nov -- An emergency session of the Council of Ministers under the chairmanship of President S. Kiprianou has been held here to discuss the situation which has developed on the island.

S. Kiprianou made a statement at the end of the session. Condemning the decision by the leadership of the Turkish Cypriot community, he stated that there can be no question of recognizing the fait accompli. I wish to stress once again, the president stated, we will not compromise on the question of Cyprus' freedom, no matter how much time we may need. The freedom of the whole of Cyprus must be restored, and the solution must be such as to fully safeguard the sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity, and nonalignment of the Cypriot state and also to restore its people's rights. In the conditions which have developed he urged "everybody to remain cool and display a spirit of unity and accord."

Ankara, 16 Nov -- As the ANATOLIA news agency reports, the Turkish Government has recognized the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus."

Athens, 16 Nov -- An emergency session of the Government Council for Foreign and Defense Policy has been held in the Greek capital. A statement adopted by it stresses that the proclamation of the "Turkish Cypriot state" creates "an unacceptable and dangerous situation for peace in the sensitive area of the southeast Mediterranean."

The Greek Government, the document notes, will not remain impartial and will not put up with this new fact.

New York, 16 Nov -- The UN Security Council is embarking on an urgent discussion of the Cyprus problem in connection with the recent events on the island. The request for an urgent meeting of the council was made by Cyprus and also by Britain as guarantor of the Zurich-London agreement under which Cyprus' independence was declared in 1960.

UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar has published a statement expressing profound regret over the proclamation of the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus." The statement notes that this step contradicts Security Council resolutions on Cyprus. It will exert an unfavorable influence on the situation on the island and complicate the UN secretary general's efforts aimed at promoting an agreed and just settlement of the Cyprus problem.

The announcement of the proclamation of the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" was made, the statement says, at a time when the UN secretary general's special envoy had arrived on the island to begin consultations to prepare for a top-level meeting with the aim of paving the way to the resumption of serious intercommunity talks.

As is known, Security Council and UN General Assembly decisions define the bases for a political settlement of the conflict on the island. The United Nations has advocated respect for the Cyprus Republic's sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, and policy of nonalignment.

However these principles have not been implemented as a result of the opposition of the opponents of a free and independent Cyprus, who are seeking to maintain the division of the island and transform it into a NATO bridgehead in the eastern Mediterranean. The United States and its NATO allies regard Cyprus as a most important strongpoint on the approaches to the Near East.

SHABAYEV: U.S. TO USE CYPRUS IN LEBANON PLANS

LD162126 Moscow TASS in English 2029 GMT 16 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Boris Shabayev writes:

A new hot spot in the Mediterranean, this is how the Republic of Cyprus was described by one of Western telecasters when he was reporting on the proclamation of a separate "independent" state by the leaders of the Turkish community of Cyprus. A statement of the United Nations secretary general says that this step contradicts resolutions of the Security Council on Cyprus and will complicate the United Nations' efforts aimed at promoting a concerted, equitable and durable settlement of the Cyprus problem.

There is an old and wise rule: When some event needs to be evaluated it is necessary to establish whom it suits. So who can be interested in a new crisis in Cyprus, in creating a situation undermining a possibility of solving the Cyprus problem on the basis of the unconditional respect for independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and the policy of non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus?

The answer to this question should be sought both in the geographic position of the island and in the stand Cyprus holds on the international arena.

The geographic position of Cyprus is the eastern Mediterranean. It is lying barely two hundred kilometres off the coast of Lebanon. As the Cyprus press noted many times, this is the reason why the United States' interest in Cyprus and in NATO military bases situated on the island increased sharply.

Reporting on the United States' intensive preparation for a large-scale military operation against the Lebanese national patriotic forces, the newspaper KHARAVYI stressed, specifically, that the Akrotiri British military base on Cyprus will serve as the main initial point for the invasion. Large U.S. military forces, equipment and ammunition are being constantly airlifted to Lebanon on board heavy helicopters from that base.

As to the political stand of Cyprus, being an active member of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Republic of Cyprus declares against the reckless arms race unprecedented for its scope and rates, for the consolidation and strengthening of detente, peace and international security. It supports the proposals to turn the Balkans and the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and goodneighbourliness free from nuclear weapons, from foreign bases and troops.

The Cyprus people raised their voice in protest against the Israeli aggression in Lebanon and outrages of the occupiers on Lebanese land. The Cyprus people demand the undelayed withdrawal of interventionist forces from that sovereign Arab country. They also condemned resolutely the United States' invasion of Grenada which the House of Representatives of Cyprus described in a resolution adopted unanimously as an impermissible violation of the United Nations Charter and international law. The scope of the movement against the use of the territory of Cyprus by the U.S. forces and the forces of U.S. accomplices in the intervention in the Middle Eastern affairs is widening in Cyprus with every day.

It is easy to see that all this runs counter to the militaristic, adventuristic course of Washington and those of its partners that blindly follow in the wake of U.S. policy. Well known also is the scenario used by the present U.S. Administration in such cases.

First a conflict is provoked in the area of interest to the U.S. Administration, then "pacifiers", U.S. Marines, are being sent there under the pretext of liquidating the conflict. By the way, several thousand U.S. Marines are now stationed close to Cyprus. They are ready to be landed wherever the orders say. Before arriving in the area they have already been on Grenada...

The enemies of Cyprus wish to partition the state and to turn the island into a U.S. and NATO aircraft carrier, said General Secretary of the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL) Ezekias Papaioannou. The latest events show that the enemies of Cyprus have not abandoned their designs.

COMMENTARY ON KHADDAM'S VISIT TO MOSCOW

LD121822 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 12 Nov 83

[Aleksandr Timoshkin commentary]

[Text] Moscow Radio has broadcast the contents of the official documents regarding the visit of 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, Syrian foreign minister, to Moscow and his talks with Andrey Gromyko, Soviet foreign minister. I would like to draw your attention to the stance of the Soviet Union toward the issues of the Middle East. This stance has once again been reaffirmed during the talks held in Moscow and in the speech delivered by Andrey Gromyko at the breakfast banquet held in honor of Syrian Foreign Minister Abd al-Halim Khaddam.

The Soviet foreign minister specifically pointed out that the situation in the Middle East is increasingly tense. This is one of the direct results of Washington's adventurist policy bent on maintaining the prevailing conditions in the world for the United States in order to impose its will from a position of strength over countries and peoples. The shining example of this is the situation in Lebanon and the policy of vicious imperialist intervention in Lebanon's affairs, a matter that has become a real tragedy to the Lebanese people. In this connection, the Soviet Union seriously warned those who are making plans to extend armed intervention in Lebanon's internal affairs and of its people. At the same time, the Soviet Union positively viewed the signing of agreements among the warring Lebanese factions regarding a cease-fire. The Soviet Union supports the constructive national dialogue in Lebanon to strengthen and broaden the struggle base for the unity and independence of this Arab state, which will adhere to the policy of nonalignment and maintain firm relations with the Arab world, to which Lebanon belongs.

Andrey Gromyko went on to say that the Soviet Union considers it necessary for the Israeli intervening force to withdraw immediately -- followed by the so-called multinational forces, namely the military units of the United States and other members of NATO countries -- in order to normalize the situation in Lebanon and around it. During the talks between Andrey Gromyko and 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, the principled and constant stance of the Soviet Union was once again confirmed toward settling the Middle East issues. The Soviet Union, as has been the case in the past, starts from the point that the constructive path for settling the issues of the region lies in convening of an international conference.

I would like to remind you that the Soviet Union calls for all parties concerned in a just and lasting solution in the Middle East to take part in the work of this conference, including the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The parties must enjoy firmly equal rights. The Soviet Union is confident that the enemies of the Arabs will not succeed in imposing separatist capitulation on the Arabs at this conference, because the front of those who dictate the struggle with firmness for the victory of the just cause of the Palestinian people and other Arab peoples will be placed within the framework of this conference face to face with the Israeli-U.S. hostile alliance. Naturally, all this demands, above all, an assured strong solidarity and high level of cooperation of all Arab countries, a matter that will greatly help to bring closer the prospects of a just and comprehensive solution in the region. Andrey Gromyko said that the enemies of the Arabs are foremost seeking the fragmentation of the Arabs to bolster their hostile policy. In this connection, the Soviet Union considers it important; it is urgent to overcome the differences and to restore the unity in the ranks of the liberation movement of the Palestinian Arab people, which must also in the future actively and effectively work in the struggle against imperialism in the Middle East.

Regarding the Soviet Union, as often was declared by the Soviet leader Yuriy Andropov, it will also support in the future the struggle of the Arab peoples against the intrigues of imperialism and its Zionist agents, thus establishing just and lasting peace in the region. This stance enjoys high appreciation from the national forces and many of the leaders of the Arab countries who these days are pointing out that the wide support and the assistance extended by the Soviet Union to the Arabs have helped and continue to help in strengthening their steadfastness in the struggle against the forces of aggression and neocolonialism, headed by the imperialists of the United States.

SYRIAN PRESS CITED ON U.S., ISRAELI 'THREATS'

LD160035 Moscow TASS in English 2235 GMT 15 Nov 83

[Text] Damascus November 15 TASS -- Tel Aviv dispatched fresh military units to the area of the occupied Golan Heights today following bellicose remarks by Robert McFarlane, deputy assistant to the U.S. President for national security affairs, who threatened Syria with military action. According to reports reaching here, Israeli troops carried out a number of provocative sorties against the Syrian contingent of the inter-Arab peace-keeping force in Lebanon in the Al-Biqa' Valley. American combat planes re-appeared in the Lebanese sky, on reconnaissance flights over Syrian positions and positions of the Lebanese national patriotic forces.

The campaign of military hysteria and threats against Syria, launched by the ruling circles of the United States and Israel, give rise to legitimate indignation in that Arab country. Syria, the newspaper ATH-THAWRAH writes today, will never become a "banana republic" to which Washington could dictate its will. The Syrian people, the newspaper stresses, will not allow U.S. imperialism to repeat in the Middle East its interventionist action carried out in Grenada.

The newspaper TISHRIN points out that the situation in the Middle East heightened to a dangerous degree as a result of the escalation of American interference in the affairs of the peoples in that region. Syria, TISHRIN writes, feels on these days, as never before, support of the faithful friend of Arab peoples -- the Soviet Union, and other socialist countries. Relying on this support, Syria will continue to resist the U.S. policy of dictate and Washington's attempts to impose its neocolonialist orders on Arab peoples.

U.S., ISRAELI ACTIVITY IN MIDEAST DISCUSSED

U.S. 'Threatens' Grenada 'Tactics'

LD160946 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Nov 83

[Sergey Losev commentary]

[Text] Washington has added open threats to Syria to its moves to build up tension in Lebanon. A U.S. naval armada carrying aircraft and Marines has been massed off Lebanon's shores. The presidential new National Security Adviser, McFarlane, has threatened to use Grenada tactics against Syria. Here is commentary by Sergey Losev:

Washington has moved from broad support for Israeli aggression against the Arabs to direct armed interference in the affairs of the Arab countries.

Having given the Israeli forces of invasion the go-ahead in 1982, Washington undertook to turn Lebanon into a base for expanding the American military presence in the Middle East with Israel's help, crush the Palestinian resistance movement, and impose a puppet administrative autonomy on the Arabs in the occupied West Bank and Gaza, in the expectation that these areas will in the end be annexed by Israel.

Israel and the United States were taking concerted action within the framework of their agreement on strategic cooperation. As a result of that concerted action, Lebanon had to sign, at the point of naval guns, an unfair agreement with Israel, in spite of the fact that the agreement was rejected by most Lebanese, and by most Arab countries. The country was in fact partitioned, and its independence was placed in grave danger. Washington and Tel Aviv have failed, however, to reach other objectives of their aggressive plans. At the moment the forces that mounted aggression against Lebanon are planning to crush the national patriotic forces of the country and at the same time strike out at Syria. The U.S. governing circles want to turn Lebanon into a U.S.-Israeli protectorate. This amounts to a crude violation of the rules of international law and the principles of the UN Charter, and a violation of the right of the nations to self-determination. But the Middle East is not the tiny island state of Grenada.

At the Syrian-Soviet talks just over here in Moscow, the two sides exchanged their views on threats to Syria coming from the United States and Israel, and the possibility of aggression being launched against Syria. The Soviet Union supported Syria's stand and pledged its continued support for the struggle of the Syrian, Palestinian, Lebanese and other Arab nations against the policy of expansion followed by the United States and Israel in the Middle East. The Soviet foreign minister, Andrey Gromyko, underlined that bearing in mind the dangerous development of situation in Lebanon, the Soviet Union is warning all those planning to expand armed interference in the internal affairs of the country and the Lebanese people against proceeding with their plans.

The Soviet news agency TASS has said that Washington's claim to establishing a social order of its own choice in other countries contrary to their wishes, its desire to place its selfish interests above international law and the interests of mankind, and its attempt to make force a legal standard of justice, may have dire consequences for other nations and the United States itself. The Soviet governing bodies have issued a grave warning to the U.S. Administration over Washington's plans for expanding armed interference in Lebanon's affairs.

'Exacerbating' Situation

LD141913 Moscow in Arabic to the Arabic World 1500 GMT 14 Nov 83

[Colonel Fedor Nikolayev commentary]

[Text] World public opinion is following with growing concern the exacerbation of the dangerous situation in the Middle East. A real danger of a new war is hanging over the region. This conclusion is reached by many observers in their analysis of developments in Lebanon and the area around it.

Who has created this danger and for what purpose? The answer to this question is one; the United States and Israel have created the danger of the outbreak of a new war in the Middle East and are exacerbating this danger in order to implement their tactical and strategic plans. The two countries are planning a large-scale military operation in Lebanon to deal a concerted blow to the nationalist forces in this country and Syria.

This is indicated by many facts. A large number of American Armed Forces units are now massed off the Lebanese coast. More than 30 American warships are now patrolling the Lebanese coast, including two aircraft carriers and a battleship, and these warships constitute about three quarters of all the U.S. Sixth Fleet warships in the Mediterranean. There are 300 warplanes and about 3,500 Marines, in addition to tanks, artillery, and Tomahawk missiles aboard these warships. It seems that the Pentagon and Washington do not consider this force to be sufficient. Thus the United States is rushing additional units of the 82d Airborne Division of the Rapid Deployment Force. Among the units being sent to the Middle East are ones which took part recently in military operations during the U.S. invasion of Grenada. At the same time, Israel carried out a deployment of the armed forces under the cover of wide-scale reserves call-up maneuvers. It is known that call-ups and the retransportation of forces have been held many times in the past in Israel under the cover of maneuvers in order to prepare aggressive operations against neighboring Arab countries.

These actions of the American and Israeli allies are being carried out amid a concentrated propaganda campaign in which senior politicians and military men in the United States and Israel give the orders. General John Vessey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that he did not exclude dealing a blow to Lebanon, and gave the understanding that Syria is now the target. Israeli political and military leaders also talk in this open, aggressive spirit.

Thus it becomes clear that the United States and Israel intend to use the existing tension in the Middle East in general, and in Lebanon in particular, to widen and consolidate the U.S. military presence in Lebanon. This tactical objective of Washington is being referred to as the minimum level. As to the strategic objective, it is the consolidation of U.S. military control over the Middle East. The United States became intoxicated by its ruthless action in Grenada and now intends to repeat the Grenada scenario in the Middle East against Syria. But all the actions and intentions of the United States and Israel not only threaten Syria but also the independence of other Arab countries and the coordination of their actions aimed at aborting the basic aggressive plans of the United States and Israel acquire extreme importance. This was pointed out during the talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko and his Syrian counterpart, 'Abd Al-Halim Khaddam, who confirmed their principled attitude aimed at supporting the struggle of the Lebanese people for the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Lebanon. It was also pointed out that the preservation of Lebanon as a sovereign state urgently requires the withdrawal of the forces of the Israeli enemy, and of the American and NATO forces from this country, immediately and unconditionally, in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council.

'Saber-Rattling'

PM151451 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 83 First Edition p 5

[Yuriy Glukhov "Commentator's Column": "The Occupiers Are Saber-Rattling"]

[Text] The Israeli Army has just finished major military exercises. Tens of thousands of reservists were called up to take part. They rehearsed mobilization readiness for so-called "lightning" strikes and for carrying out new "blitzkriegs."

Tel Aviv's military rehearsal appears particularly sinister against the background of the situation which persists in the Near East. Shots are again thundering on the occupied Palestinian lands, where Israeli thugs fire on protest demonstrations against the occupiers. The aggressor's troops, consolidating their positions in southern Lebanon with fire and the sword, are continuing to concentrate in the Syrian salient.

At the same time the American military has sharply increased its activity. As is known, the Pentagon has concentrated a whole armada of warships, including nuclear aircraft carriers, off Lebanon's shores. Reinforcements keep being sent from across the ocean for the U.S. Marines who have landed on the Lebanese coast. Washington's actions are becoming increasingly dangerous. American planes, not confining themselves to bombing raids against the peaceful Lebanese population, have started making provocative flights over Syrian positions.

U.S. and Israeli intrigues once again clearly demonstrate the aggressive nature of the alliance of imperialist and Zionist forces, which seek to turn the Near East region into their own patrimony. It is now a question of a new extension of the sphere and scale of provocations. THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper reports that Israeli Prime Minister Shamir will soon visit the United States for talks on "closer American-Israeli strategic co-operation." On the eve of this visit the American hawks have prepared a gift for their Tel Aviv colleague. The volume of military aid to Israel in 1984 is to be the biggest ever approved by the U.S. Congress for that country.

Attention must be drawn to the fact that the militarist activeness of Tel Aviv and Washington has increased sharply in a period in which serious steps are being undertaken to normalize the situation in and around Lebanon. The Soviet Union greeted with satisfaction the news of the cease-fire between the warring Lebanese groupings and the start of a constructive national dialogue. It is also necessary to note the importance of overcoming splits and restoring unity in the ranks of the Palestinian resistance movement. The Soviet-Syrian talks held in Moscow once again demonstrated the principled nature of the USSR's stand in support of the Arab peoples' just struggle.

In these conditions, the U.S. and Israeli actions are clearly designed to thwart any constructive efforts so as to preserve Lebanon as a military bridgehead. The saber-rattling is disguised with talk about a "peacemaking" mission. But peace in Lebanon and the Near East can prevail only when the Israeli occupiers and American interventionists go home and leave other people's lands.

USSR VIEWS ON MULTINATIONAL FORCE IN LEBANON

PM161039 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 46, 11 Nov 83 p 31

[Article by observer Andrey Stepanov in reply to reader's letter under the rubric "Talk With a Reader" -- first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] After a request made by its government to all countries several Western states have sent military subunits to the "multinational forces" in Lebanon. The Soviet Union refused to take part in this action. Nor is it taking part in the UN forces in southern Lebanon. Western and some Arab media assess this as a sign of weakness.

M.M. Sudah (Jordan), Leningrad

First of all, esteemed M.M. Sudah, I want to draw your attention to the fact that the Soviet Union's attitude toward the UN forces in southern Lebanon and the so-called "multinational forces" are two different issues.

In 1978 our country's representative in the Security Council did not object to the formation of special UN forces which it planned to deploy in southern Lebanon after the withdrawal of the Israeli troops, but it abstained in the vote because the resolution took no account of Israel's responsibility as the aggressor. The USSR believed that without that point the proposed steps would assure Lebanon's security. And indeed the UN forces were unable to prevent the Israeli troops' new invasion in June last year.

As for the "multinational forces" in Beirut sent there by several NATO countries without any UN authorization, the Soviet Union has resolutely denounced this action from the outset. Its aim is not to safeguard peace but to impose on the peoples of the region a system which would create conditions for a permanent U.S. military presence here and at the same time accord with the interests of the U.S. ally, Israel. Everything was done in full accordance with the imperial "divide and rule" logic: arbitrarily declare any part of the world to be a "zone of your interests" and then send in the marines.

The surveyors of this logic are reactionary Western imperialist circles. Unfortunately, not all countries have not detected its real point. After all, the capitalist states skillfully conceal their actions with speculative assurances of their selflessness, patronage, and protection. And some people in the so-called "Third World" countries are deliberately playing up to this logic.

I remember meeting with a Lebanese businessman in Beirut in the fall of last year. At the time he was joyfully exclaiming: "Thank God! The Americans have entered the country. Now they will introduce order here!"

For the Beirut people, deafened by the blasts of Israeli shells and bombs, the minutes of respite which ensued created the impression that the Americans were virtually "peacemakers" who had spared the Lebanese capital from destruction. Many people at that moment preferred not to remember that it was Washington which had given the "go-ahead" for the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in June last year, nor did they think much about how it is United States which is arming and financing the sinister Israeli war machine. Indeed the Americans themselves have acted cunningly in Lebanon: They promise to leave within a month, but they have stayed on for over a year now. And Congress recently authorized an extension of their stay in the country for an additional 18 months.

The more time that passes, the more deeply the United States is worming its way into the country's internal affairs, turning from a "peacemaker" into a gendarme imposing its own system on the Lebanese people. A U.S. naval armada is massed on the Beirut roadstead. White House envoys are kindling intercommunity contradictions inherited from the middle ages in the country. Matters have reached the point where the marines are taking an active part in combat operations against the Druze and Shi'ite Muslims, which has caused numerous casualties among the civilian population. These actions have angered the overwhelming majority of Lebanese people. When the patriotic forces opposed the new occupation, the United States steered a course toward building up its military presence. Since the explosion at the headquarters of the U.S. "multinational forces" contingent, the United States has been preparing an operation with a point of delivering a massive strike against the Lebanese national-patriotic forces.

I do not know how things have gone for my interlocutor since then, but as you can judge for yourself, the "multinational forces" consisting of U.S., French, Italian, and British subunits have not only not resolved the country's problems but have on the contrary aggravated them to the limit. The main problems is the continuation of the Israeli occupation of one-third of Lebanon. The United States has foisted onto the Lebanese Government a crushing agreement with Israel which is rejected by the majority of Lebanese and Arab countries.

The question of, for instance, the fate of the Palestinian refugees who have found sanctuary in Lebanon is also acute.

The Soviet Union upholds the view that it can only be resolved within the framework of an all-embracing Near East settlement satisfying the lawful national rights of the Arab people of Palestine. And the "Multinational Forces", which are formally intended to protect the refugee camps but which in fact, as you recall, were unable to prevent the carnage in Sabra and Shatila, do not make the situation any easier.

I think you will agree with me that the problems of this long-suffering country -- and primarily the safeguarding of its sovereignty and territorial integrity -- can be resolved only on democratic basis with the participation of all religious-community groupings and political forces without any outside interference, that is, when Israel unconditionally withdraws its troops and the "multinational forces" leave Lebanese shores. That is why our country has always been opposed to the introduction of the "multinational forces" and, conversely, has welcomed steps like the reaching of a cease-fire agreement between the sides in the internal Lebanese conflict and the start of the work of a conference on national reconciliation in Lebanon.

Of course, everything I have said does not mean that the Soviet Union tolerates imperial logic and is offering no assistance to the peoples struggling for their liberation and opposing the aggression of imperialism and Zionism.

Egypt and Syria achieved successes in the 1973 war thanks to Soviet weapons. As a result of military cooperation with the USSR, Syria, according to its leadership, now has everything necessary to resolutely rebuff the aggressor. The Palestine resistance movement has frequently thanked our country for its military and moral-political support for the just cause of the people of Palestine. King Husayn of Jordan has frequently stated that a fair settlement in the Near East is inconceivable without the participation of the Soviet Union, which invariably supports the Arabs. These, esteemed M.M. Sudah, are just a few specific examples of the positive role played by our country's policy in the region.

MADAGASCAR FOREIGN MINISTER VISITS MOSCOW

Bemananjara Arrives

LD131441 Moscow TASS in English 1416 GMT 14 Nov 83

[Text] Moscow November 14 (TASS) -- Jan Bemananjara, minister of foreign affairs of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, arrived in Moscow today for a brief working visit.

At the airport the guest was met by Nikita Ryzhov, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and by other officials. Among the welcoming party was Frederic Randriamamony, the ambassador of Madagascar to the Soviet Union.

Meets With Gromyko

PM161126 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] On 15 November A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister, received J. Bemananjara, foreign minister of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar. The minister delivered a message from President D. Ratsiraka to Yu.V. Andropov.

During the talk, which took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere, there was an exchange of opinions on several questions of Soviet-Malagasy relations and a number of international problems of mutual interest.

Those taking part in the talks voiced grave concern in connection with the threat created to the cause of peace and the peoples' security by the U.S. course toward cranking up the arms race and achieving military superiority.

A.A. Gromyko stressed that the Soviet Union is doing everything possible to avert the looming danger, to defend peace in the world, and to seek an improvement in the international situation. This is convincingly borne out by Yu.V. Andropov's statement and specific Soviet peace initiatives.

J. Bemananjara assessed highly the Soviet Union's peace-loving policy and its proposals aimed at preventing a thermonuclear conflict, safeguarding lasting peace, and curbing the arms race in the interest of resolving the urgent socioeconomic problems facing mankind.

The sides resolutely denounced the U.S. aggression against Grenada and the policy of imperialist interference in the internal affairs of Central America and the Caribbean.

They were unanimous in the opinion that the reason for the new aggravation of the situation in the Near East and primarily in Lebanon is Israel's continuing aggression and constantly expanding U.S. interference in the Arab countries' affairs.

During the talk attention was paid to discussion of the situation in the Indian Ocean. The Soviet Union and Madagascar fully support the nonaligned countries' proposal to turn the region into a zone of peace and advocate the withdrawal of naval forces which do not belong to littoral states and the abolition of foreign military bases. They denounced attempts to prevent the convening of an international conference on the Indian Ocean.

During the exchange of opinions on the situation in Africa the sides noted the persisting tension in the south of the continent, where the racist regime of the Republic of South Africa, encouraged by the United States and several of its NATO allies, is waging an undeclared war against Angola, resorting to aggressive actions against Angola, and other neighboring states, and creating every obstacle to a settlement of the Namibian question.

Both sides confirmed their unvarying support for the Namibian people's national liberation struggle under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and stated the need to implement the UN decisions on granting independence to Namibia. A.A. Gromyko and J. Bemananjara expressed satisfaction with the development of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Madagascar in the mutual interests of both countries and the consolidation of peace and security in Africa and throughout the world. The mutual desire was expressed to further intensify and develop these relations. A.A. Gromyko gave a luncheon in J. Bemananjara's honor during which the ministers exchanged friendly toasts. On the same day the guest from Madagascar left the Soviet Union.

USSR, ANGOLA AGENCIES SIGN CULTURAL PLAN

PM161053 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Nov 83 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Plan Signed"]

[Text] Luanda, 15 Nov -- A cultural cooperation plan for 1984-1985 between the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the USSR-Angola Friendship Society, and the Angolan League of Friendship and Solidarity with the Peoples of Foreign Countries, has been signed in Angola's capital. The document envisages the further expansion of cultural links between the USSR and the People's Republic of Angola.

PONOMAREV MEETS WITH CAPE VERDE DELEGATION

PM161420 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] On 14 November B. N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the COSU Central Committee, and R.A. Ulyanovskiy, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, met with a delegation from the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde (PAIGC) headed by Vasco Cabral, member of the Politburo and permanent secretary of the PAIGC Central Committee.

V. Cabral conveyed a personal message to Comrade Yu.V. Andropov from Joao Bernardo Vieira, general secretary of the PAIGC and chairman of the Council of the Revolution of the Republic of Guinea Bissau.

The delegation provided information relating to the PAIGC'S activity aimed at implementing progressive transformations, ensuring the country's economic autonomy, and improving the working people's standard of living. It expressed sincere thanks to the CPSU and the Soviet people for their aid and support to the people of Guinea-Bissau during their struggle against Portuguese colonialism and in the period of building an independent state. The PAIGC representatives assessed highly the USSR's foreign policy initiatives, whose aim is to preserve and strengthen peace and to rid mankind of the threat of thermonuclear war.

The CPSU representatives described the vigorous activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state in defense of peace and against imperialism's aggressive policy. They gave information relating to the Soviet people's selfless labor in implementing the decisions of the 26th party congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums and noted that the successful fulfillment of the quotas of the 11th 5-Year Plan is raising the socialist economy and the people's welfare to a new level. The Soviet side expressed solidarity with the Guinean people, who under the PAIGC's leadership, are marching along the path of independence and social progress. Those taking part in the meeting resolutely denounced the barbaric U.S. act of aggression against Grenada and stressed that joint efforts by all the world's peace-loving forces are needed to rebuff the policy of imperialism. The talks took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

CUBA PROCLAIMS NATIONAL PERIOD OF MOURNING

LD131239 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 13 Nov 83

[Text] Havana, November 13, TASS -- Cuba's Council of State has issued a decree proclaiming November 15, 16 and 17 days of national mourning for the Cuban internationalists who perished heroically in Grenada. They fell victim to the criminal aggression by U.S. imperialism against that country. The decree was signed by Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, chairman of the Council of State and the Council of Ministers of the republic.

It is also reported that a mass mourning meeting of working people will be held in Havana's Revolution Square on November 14.

U.S. CHARGED WITH 'PETTY FRAUD' IN FIGURES

PM161509 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Nov 83 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel A. Fedorov article: "Who is Creating the Bastions of Military Expansion?"]

[Excerpts] Official Washington, which has been condemned for its bandit attack on Grenada and the occupation of this sovereign state by the international community's most representative forum -- the UN General Assembly -- continues to resort to mendacious subterfuge in order to justify its act of piracy.

High-ranking Reagan administration spokesman are exaggerating the ruckus raised by the U.S. President that Grenada was allegedly "a Soviet-Cuban colony being prepared as a main military bastion for exporting terror and subverting democracy." This is being done not only contrary to common sense and the facts but despite the fact that, one after another, the "convincing arguments" dreamed up by the White House to confirm their malevolent lie are bursting like soap bubbles.

U.S. Administration spokesmen are now starting to hype the question of the fact that, going by [U.S. Deputy Secretary of State] K. Dam's official statement, "Grenada had three agreements for (military freight) deliveries with the Russians...a similar agreement with the Cubans...and an agreement on deliveries with North Korea."

It is evident that even in enumerating what the U.S. aggressors "discovered in a secret document archive" the deputy leader of the U.S. foreign policy department is resorting to juggling and manipulation. The official State Department list of documents seized by the interventionists lists not three but two agreements between Grenada and the USSR, and the protocol to one of them. As for the Grenada-Cuba agreement, this is not an agreement on deliveries of weapons and military equipment but on the granting of assistance of training servicemen.

But this petty fraud by a high-ranking spokesman of a major power is not the main thing. Something else is even more important -- the Washington administration, while arming to the teeth the most reactionary and aggressive regimes throughout the world, refuses a sovereign state its right to defense merely if its government "does not suit" the United States. But even the mere fact of the entirely unprovoked U.S. aggression against Grenada (and the White House is now plotting such an act of aggression against Nicaragua) utterly confirms yet again the competence (and duty!) of any state's leadership to take steps to defend its country's sovereignty and ensure its people's security in the face of imperialist threats. Washington would evidently like to carry out armed attacks with absolute impunity.

Many specialists even in the United States itself have been forced to admit that, in accordance with the agreements made with the legitimate Grenadian Government, it was deliveries of defensive arms (mainly small arms) and stores [imushchestvo] that were envisaged and not offensive weapons "to implement the Kremlin's sinister schemes to invade the Caribbean countries." As "proof" of the "terrifying buildup of the military might" of Grenada, Deputy Secretary of State K. Damuses the following figure -- "18,000 military uniforms" -- and, deep in thought, asks who they were meant for. But he does not say that this is a 5-year program for delivering cotton uniforms which last 6 months each.

To "prove the extent of military deliveries" the figures regarding the total cost of the USSR's and DPRK's deliveries of arms and stores earmarked over a 5-year period -- \$37 billion -- are also manipulated. In this connection (assuming a sense of conscience on the part of those who converted Soviet rubles into U.S. dollars) it should be noted that this figure (we emphasize, for 5 years) matches virtually exactly the grants made by the Reagan administration in fiscal 1983 alone toward the upkeep of the Nicaraguan counterrevolution and the CIA's subversive activities in Nicaragua.

The issue that the agreements stipulated the granting of free aid for the sovereign state's defense needs is also being exaggerated. As far as concerns the form in which the aid is granted (free, on credit, or a cash transaction), this is the inalienable right of the parties to the agreement. True to its international duty, the Soviet Union itself decides how and in what form to grant aid to the sovereign states and peoples which have embarked on the road of national and social liberation, while strictly observing the norms of international law. The tiny state of Grenada threatened nobody, but from the very start of the progressive changes in the country it was under constant threat of military intervention from its imperialist "big neighbor."

In granting aid to the peoples who have liberated themselves the Soviet Union has never put the sword into the hands of the aggressor, and has not sought and does not seek any advantage for itself. A diametrically opposed approach is followed by the sponsors of Washington-style "freedom, democracy, and legitimacy."

OAS SESSION CRITICIZES REAGAN POLICY

LD160059 Moscow TASS in English 2257 GMT 15 Nov 83

[Text] Washington November 16 TASS -- The aggressive policy of the Reagan administration in Central America and the Caribbean and a criminal U.S. invasion of Grenada came under fire at the 13th annual session of the General Assembly of the Organisation of American States. A majority of foreign ministers of the countries of the Western Hemisphere denounced that act of international banditry, emphasising that it constituted a brazen violation of the principles of international law, the Charters of the Organisation of American States and the United Nations. The reaction of an overwhelming majority of American countries demonstrated the extreme concern caused among them by the events in Grenada, said Liakat Ali Errol Alibux, prime minister and minister of foreign affairs of Suriname. Noting that the U.S. intervention in the affairs of Grenada was undermining security of all countries of the Western Hemisphere, he said that it posed a threat to national sovereignty and the very existence of those independent countries.

Bernardo Sepulveda Amor, minister of foreign affairs of Mexico, described the U.S. invasion of Grenada ordered by the Reagan administration as an example of further escalation of U.S. military intervention in the affairs of Central America.

He said that Mexico strongly condemned the U.S. encroachment on the principles of non-intervention in the affairs of other countries, the violation of their territorial integrity and the right to self-determination. He said that such criminal acts were incompatible with the Charters of the Organisation of American States and the United Nations.

The intervention of the USA and a number of other Caribbean nations in Grenada, Brazil's representative Dario Moreira de Castro Alvez stressed, had dramatically aggravated the situation in the entire Latin American region.

PRAVDA ON U.S. 'POLICY OF TERROR' IN GRENADA

PM150930 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Lording It in Grenada"]

[Text] New York, 11 Nov -- The puppet regime imposed on Grenada by the American occupiers is pursuing a policy of terror on the island. According to a UPI report from Saint George's, Scoon, Grenada's former British governor general, acting on the instructions of his Washington bosses, has issued an order for the totally unsanctioned arrests of "unreliable" or "suspicious" persons, primarily supporters of M. Bishop's government. He has also banned the holding of meetings and rallies and announced the introduction of press censorship.

The United States is making accelerated preparations to create its own bridgehead on the island for new acts of aggression in the region. CBS-TV has shown a report from Saint George's on the unloading of giant American military transport aircraft with military equipment. Dozens of military jeeps, trucks, and other hardware, the television network points out, are hastily being transferred to Grenada. In the opinion of CBS, it is a question of turning Grenada "into a new military base of the Pentagon."

The scale of the transfer of provisions and equipment for the American Army to the island graphically indicates that the United States plans to remain there for an indefinite period. As THE NEW YORK TIMES points out, at a meeting with journalists in Washington Pentagon chief C. Weinberger "was unable to give a 'rough date' or even establish a clear-cut criterion for the withdrawal of American troops from Grenada."

The American occupiers are continuing to commit excesses in Grenada. As news agencies report, they have mounted a hunt for patriots who have gone underground or sought refuge in the mountains but have not laid down their arms. According to an AP report, an armed clash occurred between the invaders and Grenadian patriots in one part of the island. "Ranger" subunits were urgently transferred there in helicopters to crush that hotbed of resistance. The PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER cites the words of General J. Farris, commander of the occupation corps in Grenada, who admitted that more than 1,500 American soldiers are engaged in operations to comb the island.

The American overbearance in Grenada has exacerbated that country's problem to the extreme. According to CBS-TV, "the food shortage is one of the Grenadians' most serious problems." Western correspondents point out that robberies have been flourishing on the island since the occupying authorities released criminals from prison.

COMMENTATOR VIEWS U.S. 'PLAN' FOR NICARAGUA

LD120534 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 11 Nov 83

[Viktor Olin commentary]

[Text] The Central American Defense Alliance was set up more than 20 years ago to fight Cuba's revolutionary government. The initiative came from the former Nicaraguan dictator Somoza. Unable to accomplish its task, the alliance gradually fell into decay but is now hastily being resurrected for the purpose of overthrowing the people's government in Nicaragua. Formally the initiative to revive the alliance belongs to the regimes in Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador but in effect they are only puppets taking their cue from Washington.

According to a former American ambassador to El Salvador, Robert White, the founder and overlord of the alliance is the United States Southern Command, headquartered in Panama. The strings are now pulled by the head of the Southern Command, General Paul Gorman, who is always in touch with the Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger.

As it prepares an intervention in Nicaragua the United States tries to keep in the shadow, apparently hoping to reuse the plan of aggression against Grenada. Under this plan the alliance armies, trained and armed by the United States, would only need to provoke a conflict and then appeal to Washington for help and direct military involvement. As in the case of the Grenada invasion the new attack should follow a series of preparatory moves. In the first place, it is to be expected that subversion against Nicaragua will be maximized so as to strain the situation to the limit and block efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement. Later it is planned for the Nicaraguan counter-revolutionaries to launch an attack to capture a small bridgehead and hold it long enough to proclaim an anti-Sandinista government and lodge a request with the alliance for support.

Another situation would be imaginable under which Honduras would provoke a conflict with Nicaragua alone and then appeal to the rest of the alliance. Then would come the crucial stage with the alliance calling on the United States for help and with the latter committing its forces in the bid to bring down the popular government in Nicaragua. These are the key provisions of the plan reported to have been worked out by the Central American Defense Alliance under United States leadership.

In the meantime American armed forces have been engaged in practical preparations for aggression. Next week they plan to hold an exercise in landing American Marines on the Honduran coast, whose terrain resembles that of Nicaragua. There is no ruling out the possibility that the landing party has already been told to be ready to save American lives and property.

SUPREME SOVIET DEBATES FINLAND TREATY, BUDGET

PM161019 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 83 Morning Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report: "Session of USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] On 11 November a routine session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium was held in the Kremlin.

The Presidium examined the question of the ratification of the protocol between the USSR and the Republic of Finland on extending the term of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance of 6 April 1948.

On the instruction of the USSR Government, which submitted the protocol for ratification, a report was delivered by V.F. Maltsev, USSR first deputy foreign minister. Setting out the content of the protocol, he emphasized that in extending the term of the treaty, the Soviet Union and Finland proceed from the need to ensure a firm and reliable basis for friendly, good-neighborly relations and to guarantee their long-term development, irrespective of changes in the international situation, in the interests of the peoples of both countries and of ensuring peace and security in Europe.

New impetus was imparted to the development of Soviet-Finnish cooperation, the report said, by the meetings and talks of Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and other Soviet leaders with Finnish President M. Koivisto. There is a high level of political cooperation, the steady development of mutual trade, cooperation in the construction of industrial, power industry, and other projects, of which there are now more than 20, and the expansion of scientific, technical, and cultural contacts. And, of course, there are the constantly strengthening reciprocal trust and feelings of mutual respect and friendship which link the Soviet and Finnish peoples.

B.N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Foreign Affairs Commission, spoke on behalf of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Chambers. He reported that at a joint meeting the commissions examined the protocol on extending the term of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and the Republic of Finland, signed in Moscow 6 June this year, and decided to recommend that the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium ratify it.

The treaty, B.N. Ponomarev went on to say, has been in force for 35 years, and this is the third time during this period that it has been extended without amendment before its term has expired. This time the treaty is being extended for a period running not only into the next century, but even into the next millenium. This yet again bears out its historical value, its lasting importance and vitality, and the topicality of all its provisions and principles.

We are convinced that the prevailing good-neighborly relations and the cooperation which is strengthening with every year accord with the interests of both states -- the Soviet Union and friendly Finland.

The USSR, by its practical implementation of the treaty, is developing all-round relations to the benefit of both states. Today, when the aggressive forces of reaction, U.S. imperialism, and NATO have strained the situation to the breaking point and when vigorous actions in favor of peace have become extremely necessary, the new extension of the term of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and Finland assumes particularly great importance.

This act testifies to our countries' desire to continue to pursue the policy of strengthening world peace and international security. It provides another utterly convincing demonstration that the idea of peaceful coexistence and cooperation between states with different social systems, irrespective of the size of their territories and populations, will fully retain its topicality and vitality.

The Foreign Affairs Commissions consider that the treaty fully accords with the provisions of the USSR Constitution and the country's foreign policy course aimed at strengthening peace and curbing the arms race.

Comrades P.G. Gilashvili and A.S. Barkauskas, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Comrades N.A. Zlobin and V.V. Tereshkova, members of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, who spoke at the session, noted that the extension of the treaty is an important political event not only in Soviet-Finnish relations but also at the international level, in maintaining and consolidating the all-European detente process. Soviet-Finnish cooperation provides a graphic example of how mutual relations between states with different social systems can and must be built. This cooperation is rightly described as a concrete result of the policy of peaceful coexistence which can be obtained if the sides genuinely strive for friendship, mutual understanding, and good-neighborliness.

The treaty ranks among the major international legal documents, V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, stressed. The treaty marked a radical turnabout in the mutual relations between the Soviet Union and Finland, represents an important milestone in the establishment of peaceful relations in postwar Europe, and cleared the way for multifaceted and fruitful Soviet-Finnish cooperation, whose goals it serves well. The good-neighborly relations between the USSR and Finland are stable. They are not affected by the short-term influences of the international situation.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium unanimously adopted the decision to ratify the protocol between the USSR and the Republic of Finland on the extension of the term of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance of 6 April 1948.

The meeting then discussed the question of progress in the preliminary examination by the Budget and Planning and other standing commissions of the chambers of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1984, the progress of implementation of the plan for 1983, the USSR State Budget for 1984, and the report on the execution of the budget for 1982. A report was delivered by N.I. Maslennikov, chairman of the Budget and Planning Commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet of Nationalities.

The session noted that the budget and planning and other standing commissions of the chambers are conducting a comprehensive, in-depth analysis of the draft plan and budget for 1984 on the basis of the decisions of the 26th party congress, the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums and Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's instructions on questions of speeding up the transfer of the economy onto the intensive path of development and improving planning and methods of management.

The commission's attention was drawn to the need to continue efforts to reveal additional reserves and potential to ensure and balance between all the sections of the plan and budget, particularly between the planned volumes of production and capital construction and material, technical, and manpower resources, and between the population's money incomes and expenditure.

Everything possible must be done to consolidate the positive results achieved this year and to create favorable preconditions for the successful fulfillment of the 1984 plan and the 5-year plan as a whole, the session noted.

The task was emphasized of formulating long-term guidelines in the state plans as regards all the main directions of economic, social, and cultural development, bearing in mind the demands of scientific and technical progress. This applies primarily to key problems in the economy, such as the implementation of the Food and Energy Programs, the development of machine building, transport, the manufacture of consumer goods, and the system of services to the population, the fundamental improvement of the situation in capital construction, and, in particular, the elimination of the lag in the construction of projects in the nonproduction sphere compared with production construction.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium examined other questions pertaining to the country's state life. Appropriate decisions were adopted on the questions discussed.

COMPARISON OF REPORT ON CHERNENKO-CHAired MEETING

The item entitled "Chernenko Chairs Politburo Commission 14 Nov," published on page R 1 of the 16 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, has been compared with a TASS report under the heading "Commission Session" carried in Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 November First Edition on page 2, revealing the following variation:

First paragraph, last line, PRAVDA reads: "...CPSU Central Committee. Taking part in the discussion were G.P. Veselov, RSFSR minister of education; V.S. Murakhovskiy, first secretary of Stavropol CPSU Kraykom; M.V. Fomenko, Ukrainian SSR minister of education; L.A. Gorchakov, chief of the Leningrad City and Leningrad Oblast Main Administration of Vocational and Technical Education; M.G. Minkevich, Belorussian SSR minister of education; Prof Sh.A. Amonashvili, director of the Georgian SSR Ministry of Education Pedagogics Scientific Research Institute; N.K. Baybakov, chairman of the USSR Gosplan; M.A. Komleva, director of Moscow's No 199 secondary school; People's Teacher of the USSR P.G. Lozina (Pskov Oblast); A.P. Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and academician A.N. Tikhonov, dean of the Moscow Lomonosov State University's Faculty of Computer Mathematics and Cybernetics. In conclusion, Comrade..." (picking up last line of paragraph, supplying additional passage)

ALIYEV, DELEGATION MAKE TASHKENT STOPOVER 4 NOV

PM161715 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 6 Nov 83 p 1

[UZTAG report: "Stopover in Tashkent"]

[Excerpts] A Soviet party and government delegation headed by G.A. Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, stopped over in Tashkent 4 November on its return from an official friendly visit to the SRV. The delegation comprised N.I. Ryzhkov, CPSU Central Committee secretary, and V.V. Tereshkova, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Committee of Soviet Women.

G.A. Aliyev and the other delegation members laid flowers at the grave of Sh.R. Rashidov, prominent figure of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, and expressed deep condolences to the deceased's relatives and friends.

SHEVARDNADZE ADDRESSES CHAIRMEN OF LOCAL SOVIETS

WA171111 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 27 Sep 83 pp 1-3

[Speech by First Secretary of the Georgian CP Central Committee Eduard Amvros'yevich Shevardnadze, candidate for membership in the CPSU Central Committee, at republic meeting of chairmen of ispolkoms of local soviets of people's deputies in Tbilisi on 17 September: "Soviets Must Play a Greater Role in Communist Construction"; capitalized passages published in boldface]

[Text] Comrades!

I would like to direct your attention to a significant fact: THE ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF US WHO HAVE GATHERED HERE TODAY ARE DEPUTIES OF SOVIETS ON DIFFERENT LEVELS. We also have party, soviet and economic managers, public advocates, scientists and educators, leading workers and kolkhoz members, genuine production innovators and employees among us. Almost all of the strata and segments of our population are represented here today.

All of us combined also represent soviet power, the power of soviets, which, according to V.I. Lenin's intelligent definition, is "power accessible to all." This is truly popular power, and this is the reason for its immutable historic force.

"All power to the soviet!" -- this is the militant slogan the Bolshevik Party consistently implemented during all stages of its struggle for the formation and establishment of the world's first worker and peasant state. Now that the historic achievements of socialism have become irreversible and the Soviet people have a firm hold on the democratic levers of national government, the question is HOW THE RICH POTENTIAL OF GENUINE DEMOCRACY CAN BE USED BETTER AND MORE PRODUCTIVELY, HOW THE ROLE AND AUTHORITY OF SOVIETS CAN BE AUGMENTED EVEN MORE IN ALL SPHERES OF SOCIALIST LIFE.

Speakers at section meetings yesterday and at plenary sessions today told us many interesting and noteworthy facts about how the economy of enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhoses, rayons and cities has been reinforced in recent years, how sociocultural construction is being conducted on a broader scale in urban and rural areas and how public well-being is being enhanced. Our comrades also spoke of the changes that have taken place in the activities of soviets, their deputies and their large aktiv, and of the substantial and constructive work performed to solve the republic's most important socioeconomic, politico-administrative and cultural problems.

THIS KIND OF BUSINESSLIKE AND FRANK DISCUSSION IS OF TREMENDOUS VALUE IN THE EFFORTS TO SHARE EXPERIENCE AND IMPROVE ALL FACETS OF SOVIET ACTIVITY.

There is also another side to our meeting. Its organization stemmed objectively from the very nature and distinctive features of the tasks facing our socialist state and state organs of republic administration during the current stage of our socioeconomic development.

The 26th CPSU Congress and the June (1983) CPSU Central Committee Plenum provided us with a complete description of DEVELOPED SOCIALISM. One of its principal features is THE CONTINUED EXPANSION OF THE DEMOCRATIC BASES OF ADMINISTRATION AND THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF WORKER INITIATIVE.

Under these conditions, great importance is naturally attached to THE INCREASED INDEPENDENCE OF LOCAL SOVIETS as organs in which millions of Soviet people become actively involved and participate in public administration.

The role and significance of soviets of people's deputies are augmented considerably by the process of THE FURTHER IMPROVEMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY OF THE SOCIALIST ECONOMY, which gives them additional leverage to encourage more active creative efforts by the laboring public and exert stronger pressure on labor teams.

In general, all of the advances recorded in the new Soviet Constitution reflect an objective and natural transition to COMMUNIST SELF-GOVERNMENT AND TOTAL DEMOCRACY.

In his article, "The Teachings of Karl Marx and Some Aspects of Socialist Construction in the USSR," Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, wrote:

"During the construction of the new society, the content of socialist democracy is enriched, previous restrictions disappear and the practice of democracy takes on various forms. This process is inextricably connected with the development of the socialist state, which is also undergoing qualitative changes. The most important of these is the evolution of dictatorship by the proletariat into government by all the people."

It is quite understandable that speakers at our meeting concentrated precisely on questions connected with the implementation of party decisions and the basic provisions of the USSR Constitution and with the continued enhancement of the transforming power of the socialist democratic state, which revolves around soviets of people's deputies.

The experience accumulated over several years testifies that the soviets, which REPRESENT A COMBINATION OF LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE POWER -- that is, they make decisions and assume the responsibility for their implementation -- are capable of guaranteeing highly mobile and efficient administration and the concentration of forces and resources in key areas. Wherever soviet organs are active and are skillfully performing a combination of administrative, organizational, supervisory and indoctrinational functions, they are generally having an effective influence on all major socioeconomic processes.

The group of tasks facing local soviets of people's deputies and their ispolkoms is quite broad and diverse. These tasks stem from the communist party line in economic and social policy, which is actively promoted by our soviets.

Proceeding from this basis, we can define the main aspects of their activity in the most general terms as:

THE MAXIMAL ENHANCEMENT OF NATIONAL ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY AND THE IMPROVEMENT OF ITS QUALITATIVE INDICATORS;

THE CONSISTENT IMPLEMENTATION OF A BROAD PROGRAM OF SOCIAL REFORMS;

CONTINUED EFFORTS TO BROADEN AND DEEPEN ALL FACETS OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY AND TO REINFORCE THE POLITICAL BASES OF THE SOVIET STATE IN THIS MANNER;

THE ENFORCEMENT OF STATE DISCIPLINE AND THE STRICT OBSERVANCE OF SOCIALIST LAWS AND CIVIL RIGHTS.

All of these matters were discussed in the report of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and in the extremely thorough and interesting speech by Comrade P.G. Gilashvili.

As a deputy, I would like to conclude our meeting by expressing some thoughts on ways of augmenting the activity of local soviets, enhancing their professional and political authority and strengthening their party management.

I

THE WELL-ORGANIZED AND UNINTERRUPTED OPERATION OF THE ENTIRE ADMINISTRATIVE MECHANISM IS A REQUIREMENT OF THE PRESENT DAY AND A POLICY-PLANNING OBJECTIVE. It is an integral part of the overall process of improvement in our social order, Comrade Yu.V. Andropov stressed at the June of the CPSU Central Committee.

Who is it, if not soviets of people's deputies on all levels, that will be primarily responsible for the attainment of this major objective? This is particularly true now that the authority of local government organs with regard to enterprises, establishments and organizations located within their territory has been augmented considerably in recent years. They have now been endowed with greater powers, and this, as we know, simultaneously assigns greater responsibility to each soviet worker and each deputy.

In particular, rayispolkoms now have much more opportunity to concern themselves more actively and productively in the activities of all national economic branches in their regions -- industry, agriculture, construction, trade and public services, questions of social development, public health, education and culture, administrative organs, work with the population in the community, mass physical culture and so forth.

On the one hand, the soviet is a collective, democratic organ, but on the other it is an element of the supreme authority and it is therefore responsible for the strict enforcement of legislation and the observance of statewide interests on the local level. The plan for economic and social development, as you are well aware, comrades, is state law.

Our economic growth rates, our social policy and the welfare of the Soviet people depend largely on the observance of this law in all areas. If, for example, the city of Rustavi, Borzhomskiy Rayon and some other rayons have been unable to keep up with commercial production plans for 8 months, there is no question that city and rayon executive committees must bear some of the responsibility for this. This extremely important indicator has not been reached by 78 republic enterprises, and they must share the blame for this with local soviets, including some comrades sitting in this room.

We have recently had much to say about the need for the better combination of sectorial and territorial planning. It is precisely the soviet that can play the leading role in this process. After all, all city and rayon PLANNING COMMISSIONS are accountable to the soviets.

I must say quite frankly that the performance of the majority of planning commissions still does not meet the requirements of the new conditions of economic management. But they are supposed to serve executive committees as a reliable basis of support in securing the comprehensive socioeconomic development of rayons and cities. Our comrades must master modern methods of economic analysis, find the BOTTLENECKS in enterprise and organization operations and search for production reserves.

Ispolkoms and local planning agencies can also exert effective influence on the five-year and annual plans of enterprises of union and union-republic jurisdiction, particularly in the areas of land use, environmental protection, construction, the use of labor resources, consumer goods production and sociocultural and consumer services.

A special effort must be made to AUGMENT CONSUMER GOODS PRODUCTION. We have stressed repeatedly at Central Committee plenums and meetings of the aktiv that this problem should be solved on the local level in the same way that the food program is being carried out, that every opportunity must be taken for the fuller satisfaction of effective public demand.

We know that in some places, such as Tbilisi, Kutaisi, Poti, Rustavi and Batumi, our comrades have begun an earnest search for solutions to this problem, are striving to take a creative approach to the matter and are conducting experiments. This is being done with the active participation of soviets and their ispolkoms. But this is more likely to be the exception than the rule. The failure to respond quickly to this problem is inexcusable. After all, this is a major aspect of state policy. Huge sums of money have been accumulated in the republic and are essentially out of circulation. Under these conditions, the problem of providing people with the necessary goods is of absolutely fundamental significance, and I could even call it a problem of social and political importance. We must do everything within our power to create an abundance of these goods.

In spite of the fact that a few indisputable improvements have recently been made in regional planning, local organs still have a long way to go to improve the balances of the main agricultural products, local construction materials and fuel, the potential of construction organizations, labor resources and public income and expenditures. A knowledge of these categories is imperative in the qualified administration of the most important economic and sociopolitical processes in the developed socialist society. Comrades, all of you chairmen of rural and village soviets -- I am not referring here to rayispolkoms and gorispolkoms -- must gain a deeper knowledge of these terms and make all spheres of activity manageable. This will enhance the role and significance of our soviets considerably and will raise the level of the work of planning commissions.

As yet, many of them are still simply ascertaining facts and confining their work to the collection of various types of information from enterprises and organizations instead of becoming a genuine regional economic headquarters. Of course, this is partially due to the low level of professional training and insufficient authority of some heads of planning commissions and financial workers. It might be wise TO ORGANIZE SPECIAL ADVANCED TRAINING COURSES FOR THIS CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL IN THE GEORGIAN SSR GOSPLAN. Please give this matter your consideration.

As for authority, this is an extremely serious problem. Rayon and city planning commissions are made up of the administrators of local statistical, financial and banking organs and the economic offices of large enterprises. Their services must be enlisted more efficiently, and the exact duties and responsibilities of each must be defined.

The chairman of the planning commission is an important figure on the city or rayon level. Now he is simultaneously the deputy chairman of the executive committee. When the Central Committee made this decision, it was certainly not guided by formal considerations. If he still does not possess enough authority -- and we have seen signs of this -- the ispolkom or party rayon or city committee must have the last word.

More active involvement in the formation of planning commissions and the republic Gosplan is apparently needed. We know that proposals have been made to this effect, and now we must accelerate their implementation and establish more frequent contacts with local planning organs.

The executive committees of local soviets of people's deputies can do much in the improvement of CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION. These matters were discussed by almost all of our speakers. Usually, everyone wants more industrial and agricultural facilities and residential and public buildings to be erected in the region.

This is an understandable and valid wish. But how is this construction to be financed? After all, the effective use of capital investments must be secured first. All projects must be completed on schedule, and all allocated resources must be used efficiently and intensively. Our failure to cope with projects costing 500,000 to a million rubles in the past years is clear evidence of mismanagement. As soon as order is restored, we will build more.

The practice of taking inventory of all construction projects in a city or rayon -- both large and small -- to make this sphere manageable deserves consideration. Now most of this work is performed by party committees. In our opinion, however, ISPOLKOMS OF LOCAL SOVIETS SHOULD GRADUALLY ASSUME CONTROL. This, Comrades, is one of your absolute duties.

Regional efforts to secure higher rates of socioeconomic development in the Georgian SSR have become perceptibly more intensive. At one plenum, we stressed that EACH CITY AND RAYON AND EACH AUTONOMOUS UNIT, AND NOT JUST THE REPUBLIC AS A WHOLE, SHOULD USE THE UNION AVERAGE AND THE BEST INDICATORS IN THE COUNTRY AS A REFERENCE POINT FOR ITS OWN GROWTH AND STRIVE TO CORRECT EXISTING SIGNS OF UNDERDEVELOPMENT.

You know that the Georgian CP Central Committee and Council of Ministers have attached great significance to the fulfillment of additional regional assignments in recent years, particularly in connection with the natural calamities that annually inflict serious injuries on the republic economy. Regional commissions set up to find reserves for the increased production of manufactured goods have become actively involved in this work. The territorial groups formed by inspection agencies of the Central Committee Department of Organizational Party Work are also giving the matter the most serious consideration. The time has obviously come for THE BETTER COORDINATION OF THE ACTIVITIES OF REGIONAL COMMISSIONS, TERRITORIAL GROUPS AND REPUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LINKS WITH THE WORK OF ISPOLKOMS AND, IN PARTICULAR, LOCAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS. After all, many reserves as most visible on the local level. Sometimes our comrades know of such reserves, and this potential must be utilized to the maximum.

This also applies to AGRICULTURE and to the branches serving it. The ability of soviets to influence activities in this sphere is constantly growing, particularly in connection with the rayon agroindustrial associations (RAPO's) under their jurisdiction and with the implementation of other decisions of the May (1982) CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The agroindustrial associations are part of the soviet system and are managed by the soviets. As a result of this reorganization, their responsibilities were not diminished and, in fact, were augmented.

The better management of the agroindustrial complex has already produced perceptible positive results. Nevertheless, there are unsolved problems which are having a significant effect on the final results of our agriculture. It would seem that all new administrative links of the agroindustrial complex in the republic have been functioning long enough to have completed their process of adaptation, but things are not going as well as we would like or as well as we had the right to expect. In some places the old methods are still being used, the necessary turning point has not occurred, errors are being made in the hiring and placement of personnel and people are not being encouraged or stimulated enough.

This is exactly the time for the association chairman to play his important part. He has been assigned great responsibilities, but he has also been given more authority. The chairman of the RAPO is simultaneously chairman of the association council and its board, the first deputy chairman of the rayispolkom and a member of the party raykom bureau. Therefore, he is not only a highranking economic administrator, but also a soviet and party leader, and the future of the rayon agroindustrial complex has been entrusted to him.

As the head of a government agency, he can and must influence the farms, enterprises and other services making up the association, not only through the RAPO staff but also by ACTIVELY ENLISTING THE SERVICES OF VILLAGE AND RURAL SOVIETS, OR -- MORE PRECISELY -- RELYING ON THEM AND ESTABLISHING CLOSE AND BUSINESSLIKE CONTACTS WITH THEM. It is his duty to work with rural and village soviets in mobilizing the laboring public to carry out the food program and increase output on farms of all types.

Rural soviets can accomplish a great deal here. Of course, kolkhozes and sovkhoses have certain types of economic leverage and cooperative relations with the public. But we must not forget that rural soviets, as organs of the Soviet Government, have a great deal of authority and influence. They are closest of all to the people.

It was with the active participation of rural soviets that realistic, stepped-up food programs were drawn up for the kolkhozes in the rural communities of Rioni near Tskhaltubo and Ninigori in Lagodekhskiy Rayon, the Shavshvebskiy Sovkhoz in Goriyskiy Rayon and others which were discussed by the Central Committee at meetings of the food commission.

Just recently we discussed the Martkopskiy rural soviet's activity in the implementation of the food program at a Central Committee Bureau meeting. Last year the population here sold the state 50 more tons of meat, 2.5 more tons of cheese, 4 more tons of wool, 60,000 more eggs and 568 more tons of fruit than the year before. Virtually all assignments were overfulfilled.

The agricultural output is growing this year too. One of the fundamental factors of this growth is stronger discipline. Deputies and segments of the aktiv have been made responsible for specific rural communities, and rural gatherings are held regularly. Many social problems are solved at this time.

The report of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium quite correctly raised the question of AUGMENTING THE ROLE OF SOVIETS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRIVATE SUBSIDIARY FARMING. It is precisely the job of rural soviets to ensure that not one farmyard in the community is lacking a cow or other livestock and to promote the development of cooperation between the private and public farming sectors.

Of course, it is extremely important to avoid excesses. There are still indications that rural soviet ispolkoms are sometimes totally responsible for the purchase of surplus products from the population, although they do not have the necessary resources of mixed feeds, money and transport vehicles. The managers of sovkhoses and kolkhozes, who are supposed to perform this function, are inexplicably ignoring the matter. Is this right? Of course not. But Comrade G.D. Mgeladze, chairman of the State Committee for Agricultural Production, did not say a word about this.

A Soviet Government agency cannot be turned into a procurement agent. We have economic organizations for this. When we assigned procurement functions to kolkhozes and sovkhoses, we were acting on this premise. Apparently, however, not everyone understands this. The ispolkom of the rural or village soviet must not replace procurement organizations or take on their functions. There is no question, however, that it must use the leverage at its disposal to persuade and educate people, to conduct explanatory and organizational work and to enforce the laws which we have instituted for the optimal regulation of relations between economic agencies and rural farmyards.

Here as well, we are not taking advantage of all opportunities, particularly when bad weather creates certain difficulties in the fulfillment of procurement plans. In the last 2 years, for example, the population sold the state only 55 percent of the grapes raised on private plots. Furthermore, 70,000-80,000 additional tons of fruit could have been procured from the private sector. Of course, this would have necessitated explanatory work.

Please do not think that we want to buy up all the products raised by the population. But when specific difficulties arise and the people have a substantial surplus of food resources, work with the public must be organized in such a way that people act in the interest of the entire republic and consciously and voluntarily come to our aid.

We have never had any doubts about the ideological maturity and loyalty of our illustrious rural workers. Their actions have provided ample corroboration of this. AND NOW THAT WE HAVE RESOLVED TO CORRECT THE DAMAGE INFLICTED BY THE UNPRECEDENTED HAILSTORMS AND PROCURE AT LEAST 500,000 TONS OF GRAPES IN THE REPUBLIC AND FULFILL OR OVERFULFILL ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE PURCHASE OF CITRUS FRUIT AND OTHER TYPES OF FRUIT, WE ARE CERTAIN THAT THE ENTIRE RURAL POPULATION WILL SUPPORT US IN THIS CAUSE!

Under these circumstances, a great deal depends on local authorities and the personal example set by deputies. At the same time, you must fully exercise your right to control and oversee the PRESERVATION OF EACH GRAM OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE, so that it can be PROCESSED WITHOUT LOSSES, and to immediately inform the Central Committee, the Council of Ministers, the Supreme Soviet Presidium and other republic government agencies of any developments to the contrary. It is not enough if these matters are settled exclusively by party and economic organs while the soviets and their ispolkoms remain uninvolved. WE MUST DO EVERYTHING WITHIN OUR POWER TO SEE THAT EACH PLOT OF LAND IN THE REPUBLIC IS USED TO MAXIMUM ADVANTAGE!

Being endowed with the rights of an administrator is certainly not the same thing as becoming a genuine, intelligent and zealous administrator, Comrade Yu.V. Andropov said. Public property must be treated with care. It is the express duty of government agencies to teach and encourage people to take this approach. Every soviet organ should be able to keep scrupulous accounts of kopecks and rubles. This is the most important requirement of effective management.

The augmentation of national economic efficiency is closely related to THE RENOVATION OF THE STYLE AND METHODS OF ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT.

The rapid development of productive forces requires constant improvement in production relations, and management is one element of these relations. Our soviets have a keen awareness of the need for reorganization and have engaged in a vigorous search for new methods.

The majority of regional administrative experiments in the republic have been conducted by soviet organs under the supervision of party committees. This was precisely the origin of the Abasha experiment, on the basis of which agroindustrial associations were created throughout the republic. It was with the active and concerned -- and I would even say qualified -- participation of soviets and their ispolkoms that experiments were developed in Makharadzevskiy, Goriyskiy, Gardabanskiy and some other rayons, and that the ispolkom-managed territorial intersectorial production association in Poti is now functioning.

We have discussed all of these innovations several times and there is hardly need for another detailed analysis today, but a few words should probably be said about how they are spreading to other regions. Whereas rayon agroindustrial associations are now a common form of economic management, the Poti experiment is not being utilized enough, although it has conclusively proved its viability. Of course, there are problems here, but in general this method best meets the requirements of the decree of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers on the augmentation of the role of soviets in economic construction. It allows for the more complete coordination of centralized management with economic independence and initiative on the local level by precluding an emphasis on departmental and regional interests, and the highly effective nature of this approach is not doubted wherever it is being implemented.

Here is a report from Tbilisi's Zavodskiy Rayon. This was one of the first places where some elements of the Poti experiment were taken up, and their incorporation was approached creatively. Industry in this rayon is expected to produce 9 million rubles' worth of products over and above the plan within 9 months. The production growth rate is 111.6 percent, and this is higher than the planned figure. Since the beginning of the

year, over 7 million rubles' worth of products with the State Emblem of Quality have been produced over and above the plan. For this purpose, articles whose certification was not envisaged were certified for the highest quality category at a number of enterprises. The output of consumer goods has increased considerably. Financial and economic indicators have risen dramatically. In general, wherever experiments are being conducted -- whether in Tbilisi or other regions -- the basic financial and economic indicators generally display a perceptible rise.

Another facet of the activity of the Zavodskiy rayispolkom's new subdivision is A COMMERCIAL APPROACH TO ECONOMIC PROBLEMS. It serves as the middleman when partnership agreements are being concluded by enterprises and scientific subdivisions, aids in the redistribution and use of by-products and the manufacture of consumer goods from these products and participates in the redistribution of above-norm surplus resources. Already, 39 partnership agreements have been concluded on the production of consumer goods from by-products, and goods worth 150,000 rubles have been manufactured. Interesting steps have been taken to involve departmental transport in centralized shipments.

Many helpful innovations are being incorporated with the direct participation of soviet organs in other rayons and cities. This work should be continued and expanded. THE UNCONDITIONAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF ECONOMIC CONSTRUCTION -- THE ATTAINMENT OF MAXIMUM RESULTS WITH MINIMUM EXPENDITURES -- IS THE OBLIGATION OF SOVIETS.

Ispolkoms and their offices must be encouraged to participate more in the organization and performance of bilateral measures with republic ministries and departments, particularly for the better use of labor resources. I know that this problem concerns administrators in many rayons. Although around half a million additional people began to participate in national production in the last decade, we still have even greater unutilized potential. This calls for more purposeful action, and for this reason REPUBLIC ORGANS SHOULD SPEED UP THE COMPILATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM FOR THE USE OF LABOR RESOURCES.

Joint undertakings by various organizations with the ispolkoms of the local soviets on whose territory they are located, including city organizations of rayon jurisdiction and village and rural organizations, could also be quite effective. The time has come to take bolder action in mobilizing the resources of enterprises and farms for social undertakings -- participation in the construction of residential buildings, schools, kindergartens and public health facilities and the use of the centralized funds of rayon agroindustrial associations wherever possible. In turn, the soviets should aid labor teams in the fulfillment of national economic plans, the recruitment of personnel and the reinforcement of discipline.

Of course, it is not a simple matter to organize smooth relations between enterprises, particularly large ones, and rural and village soviets. But this is necessary. The more intensive use of territorial methods of planning and management and the expansion of organizational democracy will demand precisely this approach.

The main thing is that economic managers and representatives of soviet organs must not treat each other condescendingly. This is absolutely inadmissible. We want them to work together in a friendly manner. If they cannot get along for some reason, party committees must step in to settle the matter, and even the Central Committee if necessary. Many ispolkoms still require this kind of objective support. Unfortunately, some ministries and departments are still not paying enough attention to the recommendations of deputies and standing commissions and are not responding to them in appropriate ways. We know of certain incidents of this type involving, for example, the ministries of construction, rural construction and health and the State Committee for the Tea Industry.

It seems to us that the republic Gosplan should take a more active stand in these matters because it can offer local soviets considerable procedural and practical assistance in the compilation of territorial plans for socioeconomic development.

The experience accumulated in Gardabanskiy, Khobskiy and some other rayons and several cities in the republic demonstrates the substantial impact of the participation of government agencies in the use of scientific achievements and advanced experience and the ACCELERATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS. The soviets are capable of influencing these matters greatly by turning the republic into a testing ground for everything that is new and progressive. This is precisely the objective we set at the last Central Committee plenum.

Furthermore, who, if not the authorities, should be most concerned with augmenting labor productivity and improving labor conditions? There is much that they can do in this area. Judge for yourselves: Over an entire decade the proportional number of workers engaged in manual labor in republic industry decreased by only 0.9 percent, and the figure in construction was 5.7 percent. The proportional number of sovkhoz workers performing manual labor is only 0.5 percent below the 1979 figure, and on kolkhozes it is actually 1 percent higher now. And after all, this is the direct result of insufficient interest in the use of scientific and technical achievements.

THE ACCELERATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS IS NOW THE BASIC CONDITION FOR THE FURTHER ENHANCEMENT OF NATIONAL ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY, WHICH IS ONE OF THE MAIN AREAS OF THE WORK OF OUR SOVIETS.

II

The resolution of economic problems in the socialist state is organically related to the implementation of a broad-scale SOCIAL PROGRAM.

If we work better, we will live better -- this is the socialist principle of distribution according to labor. In the final analysis, it is our duty to concern ourselves with the individual, with the improvement of his living conditions, and soviets must implement this major goal of our party consistently.

We have already stressed the fact that local soviets and their deputies must make a persistent effort to facilitate the labor of workers and employees. Many of them, however, are not even concerning themselves with this problem.

Comrades recently learned about the activities of some branches of industrial enterprises in Tsalka, Akhaltsikhe and Akhalkalaki. Labor conditions there are extremely unsatisfactory and no attention is paid to the most elementary requirements -- there is no ventilation or running water and so forth. But why are rayispolkoms and ispolkoms of local soviets remaining silent? Why are they not demanding explanations? AUTHORITY CAN BE WON ONLY THROUGH TIRELESS EFFORTS AND CONCERN FOR PEOPLE'S NEEDS.

Our laborers require good conditions in the home and in their daily life as well as on the job. At the beginning of this year, as Comrade B.E. Saralidze, chairman of the Tbilisi city soviet ispolkom, already reported, we met with gorispolkom personnel to discuss many social problems and decided that HOUSING CONSTRUCTION was one of the main issues. All local soviets must encourage the full use of capital investments allocated for housing construction. We have lost too much in this area in recent years -- tens of millions of rubles.

We must remember that 190,000 square meters of the housing in the republic consists of barracks and living quarters in cellars. This is a particularly serious problem in Tbilisi, Sukhumi, Batumi, Tskhaltubo, Gurdzhaani, Gori, Makharadze, Bolnisi and Tsiteli-Tskaro. The heads of soviet organs should ensure the unconditional fulfillment of annual plans for the liquidation of such quarters, institute stricter control to move

people out of departmental barracks and cellars and bring these matters to the attention of the appropriate agencies.

Serious shortcomings also exist in municipal and communal services and in the provision of people with water, heat and power -- and this is completely within the jurisdiction of city and rural ispolkoms.

For example, we examined the work of the Telavi city soviet in the development of municipal services. We saw some positive results: the encouragement of enterprises and organizations in the city to contribute to civic improvements. Our comrades have found the appropriate levers and channels.

Do not imagine that this is a simple matter, that you go to the plant director and immediately receive a million and a half rubles. No, of course, our economic managers are experienced individuals and anyone who wants to persuade them of anything must have a good knowledge of the law and of the appropriate decrees and directives. This is why we always say that national economic management, civic improvements and the enhancement of public well-being can only be accomplished on the basis of a thorough knowledge of economics and the law.

Of course, even our comrades in Telavi make mistakes and have their shortcomings. For example, the ispolkom has not been persistent enough in the resolution of long-range problems and rarely informs the agencies concerned about administrators who are not performing their assigned duties. Nevertheless, we feel that the work they are conducting is interesting and that it would not hurt our ispolkom chairmen to go to Telavi and take a good look at what is being done there.

In recent years much has been done in the republic to beautify its capital, its other cities and its rural communities. Our local soviets have performed tremendous services in this area, and people are grateful for the changes and are sincerely grateful to all of you.

Nevertheless, not all soviets are active enough or exercise their authority in full. Recently the Georgian CP Central Committee Bureau investigated the organizational work performed by the Kazreti village soviet of people's deputies in the socioeconomic and cultural development of the village.

The Madneul Mining and Enriching Combine is located within this soviet's territory. There is no question that its establishment changed the settlement beyond recognition. A great deal, a very great deal has been done for its development.

But we looked into the soviet's efforts to consolidate and develop socioeconomic and cultural advances and we found that they were insufficient. The soviet is not taking part in the examination of production plans and is not even familiar with the plans of enterprises within its territory. This means that our comrades here did not change their approach to meet new requirements. The soviet is not instructing its ispolkoms, standing commissions and deputy groups and stations to draw up short- and long-range assignments for economic and social development and is not organizing and supervising their fulfillment. It is making little use of the extensive authority which it now has by law.

And this is far from the worst example. Our comrades in some places display amazing passivity. There is dirt in the streets, public buildings are unsanitary, and this does not appear to bother anyone. But what about the outskirts of the community? What is going on along some highways? There is a lack of even the most elementary order. Sanitary facilities are either nonexistent or in a state of extreme neglect, and everything is badly organized. Someone must take charge! And of course, local soviets should be the first to do this.

I will tell you quite frankly that all of us are extremely upset when we go to a rayon to visit a village, a store, a hospital, a school or a library and we find dirt, ill-equipped facilities, establishments which do not even look like establishments and highways which bear no resemblance to highways. I do not think that it would be that difficult to establish at least external order here.

Take our central highway between Leselidze and Kazbegi as an example. How much disorder and confusion there is here, and not only here! There is always digging going on, and scarce pipe costing millions of rubles is left to rust under the open sky for months before it is laid in trenches.

Things look just as bad when you walk into a store -- so bad that you suspect local administrators have not even taken a look at these places for years. The most terrible thing, and I have spoken of this many times in the past, is when the eye grows accustomed to disorder, when low standards become a characteristic trait of a region, organ or worker and when people easily reconcile themselves to all this.

We drafted a program for the planting of walnut trees. The number of saplings to be planted and the locations were chosen with great care. After all, this is a colossal resource, and our children and grandchildren will reap the benefits of our efforts. But do we have any guarantee that the saplings planted in the spring will not be trampled in the fall? Is it such a rare occurrence for money and effort to be wasted or for public property to be destroyed?

Sometimes when you drive through a rural community and clouds of dust are all around, you see people selling meat right on the road, in violation of all sanitary rules and standards. Is it possible that the chairman of the rural soviet, rayispolkom personnel, the sanitary inspector and other officials do not notice this? Or have they grown so accustomed to it that they do not pay any attention to it? Of course, if people have a chance to sell meat, let them sell it, but this can be done legally by putting up a small shed or booth for the sake of cleanliness and order.

We want our republic to be known for its high cultural standards, but then we can no longer work this way and live this way! The establishment of elementary order does not require large capital investments, intervention by the union Gosplan or the publication of decisions by directive bodies. This order depends largely on us, and all of us are responsible to our people and our country for it.

Georgia is visited by 12 million people a year. They are both our propagandists and our critics. They take their impressions of what they have seen -- good and bad -- to all parts of the country. And I am not saying that order should be established just for guests, but that IT SHOULD EXIST AT ALL TIMES.

The implementation of the social program is connected not only with changes in the external image of Georgian life, but also with SERIOUS INTERNAL CHANGES, spiritual enrichment and higher political standards.

As Comrade Yu.V. Andropov remarked, a rise in the standard of living is an extremely broad term, encompassing a constant rise in public awareness and culture, including the standards of everyday life, behavior and even the standards of intelligent consumption. It includes exemplary public order and health care, a sensible diet and high-quality services for our population and the use of leisure time in pursuits of the greatest moral and aesthetic value. All of this was aptly and precisely termed SOCIALIST CIVILIZATION by Yu.V. Andropov. Soviets must constantly strive to develop valuable personal qualities that are characteristic of socialist civilization.

Today's worker is an educated person with high cultural demands which must be satisfied completely. But what is the state of the cultural and educational establishments in many of our rural communities and rayon centers? The most elementary work is not

performed, but our comrades are paid, even if not much, for this work. How should we evaluate the performance of the cultural departments of ispolkoms? Unsatisfactory, of course. Public cultural standards cannot be high without exemplary order in cultural establishments. We asked some rural soviet chairmen if they visited rural clubs and libraries often. Unfortunately, it turned out that they went there rarely. Many chairmen of rayispolkoms and secretaries of party raykoms could not even remember the last time they visited these establishments. They only go to meetings once in a while. But judging by the state of neglect, meetings are apparently held rarely. These administrators are present here today. They are our party comrades, our colleagues, and they are respected individuals, but this does not guard them against serious criticism.

And what about public health establishments? They do a great deal that is useful, but they are also the target of many valid complaints. And this is also a fundamental matter, a matter of great political importance. Workers complain about the quality of treatment, the shortage of some medicines and so forth. But the main thing is THE LACK OF INTEREST IN THE PATIENT AND IN HIS NEEDS. Here as well, soviet organs and deputies should institute stricter control over the work of each employee of a hospital, polyclinic or first aid station and institute stricter penalties for violations of medical ethics. Free medical treatment is one of the greatest achievements of our society and it is the constitutional right of each Soviet citizen. It is the duty of party and soviet organs to pay close attention to how the most important provisions of our constitution are being implemented.

Recently the Akhmetskiy party raykom bureau expelled Comrade A. Zaravandishvili from the CPSU and dismissed him from his position as chief physician of the rayon. Comrade K. Gigauri received a strict reprimand, which was noted in his record, and was dismissed from his position as deputy chief physician. Protectionism, nepotism, bribery, extortion and other serious crimes flourished here in the sphere of medicine. The death rate rose sharply and people ceased to trust medical establishments. I think that it is not enough to confine these matters just to a party decision. Comrade A.M. Barabadze, the republic procurator, spoke at this meeting. He should also investigate this matter. When a communist or a citizen ignores the basic law of the state, the procurator's office should not remain uninvolved. If evidence exists, charges should be brought against the unworthy administrators without any hesitation.

It is the duty of the ispolkom and its public health department to rely on public opinion and take it into account when the professional qualities of each worker in a medical establishment are being evaluated.

With the support of local soviets, we were recently able to reach an important turning point in SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION, primarily in rural locations. In just 8 months, 25 schools have been built here, and classes are already being held in all of them. The funds of enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhoses began to be solicited for school construction. Our comrades in Zugdidskiy, Makharadzevskiy, Goriyskiy, Kobuletskiy, Marneulskiy and some other rayons did good work in this field.

Even today, however, many schools still do not meet present requirements, particularly in rural areas, and are operating in two shifts or even three. The enlargement of the network of extended day care groups and schools must be given more attention. They are not only of educative value but also have a significant economic impact because they allow working mothers to participate more in production. OURS IS ONE OF THE LOWEST-RANKING REPUBLICS IN THE COUNTRY IN TERMS OF THE PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN ATTENDING SUCH ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS. There is also serious underdevelopment in the sphere of pre-school establishments. We would like Comrade D.L. Kartvelishvili, chairman of the Georgian Council of Ministers, to request the appropriate comrades on the council of ministers to investigate this matter thoroughly. The lack of progress in the resolution of this problem is puzzling because it appears that the Ministry of Education and other agencies have been working on it. I think bolder steps should be taken in the creation

of such complexes as the combination school and kindergarten, particularly now that they are functioning quite successfully in the country.

Labor training in the schools needs serious improvement. Of the 2,924 rural schools in the republic, 872 do not have school plots. Of course, this is a matter which cannot be ignored by local soviets. In Terzholskiy and some other rayons, for example, I was tremendously pleased to see several absolutely exemplary school plots. The children here acquire the labor skills they need so much and the schools derive additional income from the plots.

The successful education and indoctrination of the child depend directly on the teacher's personality. This matter was correctly raised by many speakers, including a man as respected in our republic as Comrade Yu.K. Tavadze, Hero of Socialist Labor and chairman of the kolkhoz in the village of Vanzomleti in Chokhotaurskiy Rayon. This is an illustrious segment of our intelligentsia. The role of the teacher was also discussed at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which resolved that his prestige and authority should be enhanced and that his qualifications and working and living conditions should be given more attention. The attainment of these objectives will depend primarily on ispolkoms of soviets of people's deputies, which must work with public education departments in the resolute eradication of disrespect for teachers and be able to give good initiatives timely support. At the same time, they must take principled action when teachers are at fault and must get rid of people whose behavior denigrates the high calling of the pedagogue. Of course, they should not interfere directly in the academic process or teaching methods. The proper agencies for this exist. But as for the moral and psychological atmosphere in the schools, this must always be a matter of primary concern. It is no secret that in many schools, to our great shame, there are unhealthy practices, including even extortion and the taking of bribes for grades, and this is absolutely inadmissible. Party organizations, soviet organs and deputies must delve deeply into these processes and put an end to these practices.

It is important to satisfy not only the individual's spiritual needs, but also his daily CONSUMER NEEDS, when he wants to buy something or have something repaired or delivered. But you all know that these are not always simple matters. Comrade N.A. Popkhadze, chairman of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, and other comrades had sharp words to say about this.

When stores do not carry the most necessary goods -- bread, soap, mineral water, toothpaste, vinegar and canned goods -- as was the case, for example, during inspections in the rural communities of Nenja in Shuakhevskiy Rayon, Salkhino in Vanskiy Rayon and Kveda-Sazano in Zestafonskiy Rayon, it is not only trade workers who are to blame, but also the ispolkoms of rayon and local soviets. This is where they must exercise all of their authority. It is intolerable when problems are artificially created as a result of the irresponsible and indifferent treatment of people. The first secretaries of party raykoms and gorkoms and the chairmen of ispolkoms should investigate each incident of this kind in detail and take serious measures, including organizational measures.

I must admit that we still do not have the necessary sense of responsibility and constant concern for the service sphere. As you know, the republic is having difficulty in fulfilling the commodity turnover plan. At the same time, despite the repeated issuance of instructions, the business hours of public service enterprises, organizations and establishments have not been regulated everywhere. There are still no consumer service or vehicle maintenance facilities (Comrades V.A. Sobolev and V.I. Zhgenti) or Ministry of Trade enterprises other than grocery stores (Comrade M.M. Kadzhaya) that open at 7 or 7:30 in the morning -- that is, before work; only 17 percent of the vehicle service stations and maintenance garages serve the public on Saturdays and Sundays, because their departmental jurisdiction is not even clear in many cases. Only a third of the service enterprises close at 8 or 8:30 in the evening.

But after all, this is probably the most elementary requirement, and you will recall that Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, issued a categorical instruction on this matter.

Some rural soviets are absolutely undisturbed by the fact that a lack of personnel closes down rural stores for months and people have to go all the way to the rayon center or even to the capital to go shopping. I would call this not only a lack of elementary enterprise, but also political nearsightedness.

The presidium report correctly stressed that rural development should take the same direction as urban development and that workers in fields and on farms have the same requirements as workers in industry. But after all, this primarily necessitates the correct organization of the efforts of local soviets and the resolution of problems that will brook no delay.

You know that members of the Georgian CP Central Committee Bureau and members of the Central Committee have established direct contact with workers, kolkhoz members and our intelligentsia. I, for example, teach political courses at the Tbilisi Electric Locomotive Plant imeni V.I. Lenin. The people there say quite frankly that there have been no perceptible changes in public services. We are spending a great deal of money but we have been unable to establish elementary order in many rayons. We make promises and assurances but all of these remain mere slogans.

It seems to me that the decisions of our fifth plenum on trade and consumer services should be a document kept on the desks of all soviet personnel and that each of you should literally memorize the plenum instructions and persist in implementing them. These are the instructions of the republic party organization.

We need order in all places and in all things, and not only in the service sphere. EXEMPLARY PUBLIC DISCIPLINE IS AN INTEGRAL ELEMENT OF SOCIALIST CIVILIZATION.

One of the articles of the USSR Constitution expressly assigns soviets the duty of "enforcing the laws, preserving state and public order and protecting civil rights." This is the origin of the great responsibility of the soviets, just as of THEIR SUBORDINATE INTERNAL AFFAIRS ORGANS, for the state of the struggle against crime.

At the January (1983) meeting of the republic party aktiv and subsequent Central Committee plenums we remarked several times that there have been definite positive advances in crime prevention and in law enforcement in general in recent years. Republic administrative organs are working more intensively. Unfortunately, however, negative tendencies still prevail in many cities and rayons.

The unsatisfactory administration of law enforcement agencies by the soviets is one of the reasons for the constant rise in crime this year in Gori, Rustavi, Tskhaltubo, Chiatura and in Akhaltsikhskiy, Signakhskiy, Zugdidskiy, Tsulukidzevskiy, Kaspskiy, Gardabanskiy and some other rayons. The administrators who are present here today should make a special study of these processes.

We are particularly disturbed by the high rate of embezzlement of socialist property, the theft of the personal property of citizens and serious traffic accidents, which arouse the justifiable indignation of the laboring public. These processes must be managed much better.

Burglaries are still an acute problem. In June the Central Committee Bureau recommended that city and rayon ispolkoms discuss each burglary at their meetings. Analyses indicate, however, that some decisions are largely of a formal nature. We want more active work in this field and we want specific measures to be taken to organize guard duty in certain places, to institute the use of burglar alarms and to secure attics, cellars and porches -- that is, to eliminate all of the causes and

conditions aiding in the commission of such crimes, particularly in cities and industrial centers.

The main factor of a socialism's existence and the main source of its development is PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION, and soviets must do everything within their power to guard them against encroachment by unscrupulous individuals, con-men, cheats and swindlers. But let us speak frankly about this and admit that there are also, unfortunately, some people in the ispolkoms themselves whose moral image does not inspire trust and who are pilferers.

You remember the tragedy in the ispolkom of the rayon soviet imeni 26 Komissarov in the city of Tbilisi. Comrade A.M. Zarabadze spoke of this. Another incident occurred in the ispolkom of the Makharadzevskiy Rayon soviet, where the cashier had been appropriating huge sums of money for several years. It was precisely for his neglect of his duties and for other violations that we had to expell the chairman of the Telavskiy rayispolkom and his deputy from the party and dismiss them from their jobs.

No matter how painful and difficult it has been for us, we have taken the strictest actions against these people and will continue to do so. There can be no mercy for those who compromise the authority of the state and who respond to public trust with cynicism!

Correct and intelligent preventive work is now of tremendous significance, and the role of soviets in this area would be difficult to overestimate. They have jurisdiction over voluntary people's militias, comrades' courts, crime prevention councils, public law enforcement stations and other public agencies of social regulation. As yet, we have not learned to use certain important organizations with maximum efficiency. This applies to the soviet standing commissions on socialist legality and law enforcement and to supervisory and administrative commissions and commissions for juvenile affairs, for the struggle against drunkenness, alcoholism and drug abuse, for job placement services and others. They should have a full workload and produce significant results.

Soviets have good potential for broader and deeper work in the community. Good steps were taken in this direction in Chiatura. Much was done in Zestafonskiy and Leninskiy Rayons in the city of Tbilisi to encourage families to play a more important part in the indoctrination of children. Today this experience is being used widely. I think that we should return to these matters and hear reports in the Central Committee on the first steps in this extremely interesting and important sphere.

The Gori gorispolkom is conducting community work comprehensively and with a view to the entire range of economic, sociopsychological and other factors. A special council has been set up and a definite system has been established. Meetings are organized with the residents of various streets and so forth.

The neighborhood soviets in the cities offer new ways of improving community work. You remember that there were many arguments and doubts when we began to create these a few years ago in the nature of an experiment. Now all of this has been forgotten and we are grateful to the Supreme Soviet Presidium for its active support of this initiative which has produced fairly good results. We now have 56 such soviets. They seem to be bringing government even closer to the people.

And this is the principal feature of the soviets. On the territorial level we have no administrative organs below rural, village and neighborhood soviets. This is the basis of our authority. THIS IS WHY THE MORE EFFECTIVE WORK OF SOVIETS ON ALL LEVELS AND THE AUGMENTATION OF THEIR INFLUENCE ON LOCAL DEVELOPMENTS NOW CONSTITUTE A MAJOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIOPOLITICAL OBJECTIVE.

III

In view of all this, THE FURTHER IMPROVEMENT OF THE OPERATIONAL STYLE OF SOVIETS ON ALL LEVELS AND THEIR EXECUTIVE ORGANS is of particular importance.

When V.I. Lenin stipulated the objectives of the party and state, he said that the main ones were the following:

"CONTACT WITH THE MASSES.

"Living WITHIN THEIR MIDST.

"Knowing THEIR FEELINGS.

"Knowing EVERYTHING.

"Understanding the masses.

"Taking the right approach.

"Winning their ABSOLUTE trust.

"Administrators must not become alienated from the administrated masses, and the vanguard must not become alienated from the entire labor army."

The most important qualities of Soviet personnel are MANAGERIAL AND EXECUTIVE ABILITY, ACCURACY, EFFICIENCY, COORDINATING SKILLS AND, OF COURSE, INGENUITY. The soviet administrative machine, V.I. Lenin said, should work accurately, precisely and quickly.

In recent years we have paid the closest attention to the improvement of the operational style of republic party and state personnel and we discuss these matters each year at a special Central Committee plenum.

It must be said that the level of the activity of the GEORGIAN SSR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS AND SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDUM has risen perceptibly. They are having a precise and specific effect on the resolution of major national economic and political problems.

The Presidium's extremely competent management of the soviets was clearly reflected in the report presented at our meeting, which contained thorough and analytical descriptions of all of the major aspects of soviet work on the central and local levels and the preparations for today's gathering. The Presidium now has much stronger control over administrative organs and is taking a more demanding and principled approach. Its personnel are trained well and the deputies of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet are growing more active, from outstanding workers and kolkhoz members to the republic leaders.

The Council of Ministers has proved to be a highly competent administrative organ. I can frankly say that this has taken much of the burden off the party staff, relieving it of many economic matters, and this process is continuing. Departments of the Council of Ministers independently investigate and solve many current problems and skillfully manage the activities of organizations.

Nevertheless, the management of the soviets must be improved even more, work must be conducted more intensively and the Leninist principles of management must be implemented in line with the demands of recent plenums of the party Central Committee and the instructions of Comrade Yu.V. Andropov.

Above all, it is important to avoid nominal management and to take bolder action. This particularly applies to the management of local soviets and their ispolkoms. We have a

great deal of potential for this. The Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers should continue perfecting the practice of studying the activities of local soviets on all levels and their ispolkoms, discussing these activities at their meetings and constantly striving to augment their role and responsibility in the attainment of major socioeconomic objectives.

Although the improvement of planning and economic management, the enhancement of production efficiency and product quality, the incorporation of technological achievements and advanced experience, the supervision of the fulfillment of plans for economic and social development and the struggle against mismanagement and waste are being discussed more frequently at sessions of local soviets, these sessions are not always put to optimal use as a major instrument of mass organizational work. They often focus on minor problems, discuss only current events and issue decisions of a general and declarative nature. Each session of a rural or village soviet, and especially of rayon and city soviets, should be an extremely important event in the life of the city, rayon, village or rural community. Sometimes, however, sessions are convened primarily for the purpose of making reports to administrative organs.

Here is another example. We have repeatedly underscored the positive work of the republic Commission To Combat Parasitism and Prevent Crime in the Community, which is headed by Comrade V.M. Siradze, deputy chairman of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. It has truly been of great help. But this cannot be said of the corresponding commissions of local soviets. Ispolkoms have been too slow in introducing the system approved by the Georgian CP Central Committee for the discovery and control of parasites and often transfer this burden to the shoulders of the militia.

The deputy aktiv and the potential of public organizations are not being used satisfactorily in the prevention of parasitism and crime in the community. Within just 1 month there were several murders in the community in Tskhaltubo. It is an absolutely abnormal situation when whole families have to leave their homes and communities because the hostility of neighbors has put them under the constant threat of arson or other forms of revenge. Here a great deal depends precisely on the stand taken by the rural and rayon soviets.

At our plenums we have also criticized some departments of the Central Committee and Council of Ministers, which have acted inefficiently and too slowly in some cases. In our opinion, the Central Committee and Council of Ministers should make a more vigorous effort to improve the work style of some economic agencies, ministries and departments in the republic.

The many personnel of CITY AND RAYON ISPOLKOMS are not being used sufficiently. Many of their functions have been taken over by party committees, and this, Comrades, is not right. Ispolkom staffs below the rayon level are small, but even here a great deal can be accomplished through the extensive involvement of deputies and the aktiv in decisionmaking. After all, the administrators of almost all enterprises and organizations in the territory are ACCOUNTABLE to the soviet because either they or other members of work teams are elected deputies. But it is precisely the efforts to mobilize deputies and the public and to make their work more productive that are not completely satisfactory. This is the principal shortcoming of soviet activity and the principal way of heightening their effectiveness.

There are 2,400 chairmen of ispolkoms on various levels, their deputies and secretaries of ispolkoms in the republic. In addition, the soviet staff consists of around 2,000 people. WE HAVE MORE THAN 50,000 SOVIET DEPUTIES. This is a truly colossal force!

Local soviets are not simply an administrative staff. They are local leaders and they must LEAD AND GUIDE THE BROAD WORKING MASSES. They have the power and authority to INVOLVE EVERYONE, and not just in the discussion of problems but also in their resolution.

"The further development of the soviet organization of the state should lead to a situation in which each member of the soviet takes on permanent public administration functions in addition to attending soviet meetings," V.I. Lenin wrote. This demand of Lenin's must be fulfilled unconditionally. A soviet deputy has extensive powers. He complies with the requests of his electors and makes suggestions. Deputies of various soviets are often united in deputy groups in their place of employment. We can remember the good practice initiated in Akhalkalakskiy Rayon. It is important to heighten the activity of these organizations.

The STANDING COMMISSIONS of the soviets are a significant instrument of administration and control. There are now around 7,000 of them in the republic. To improve their activity, closer contact should be established with ispolkoms. The fact that the commissions are not subordinate to the executive committees and are organs of the soviet itself does not mean that the ispolkoms should remain uninvolved in their activity. The ispolkom should give commission proposals timely consideration and give deputies regular assistance. This applies to the organization of discussions and seminars for commission chairmen and members and presupposes their constant familiarization with the daily affairs of the ispolkom. The standing commissions should not duplicate the work of executive organs but should concentrate on the investigation of long-range problems.

In accordance with the decree on the standing commissions of local soviets, they perform their work independently of the standing commissions of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet. The chairmen of the standing commissions of local soviets should probably be invited periodically to sessions of the standing commissions of the republic Supreme Soviet so that professional contact can be established. Obviously, the standing commissions of local soviets should be called upon to participate in the discussion of matters by the standing commissions of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet in specific regions.

It would also be wise to organize training for the chairmen of standing commissions of local soviets in the advanced training courses offered to party, soviet and economic personnel by the Georgian CP Central Committee. Today this kind of "vertical" connection with local soviets is extremely necessary.

The work style of soviets is distinguished by highly COLLECTIVE action. This stems from their very nature as collective organs of popular power. This principle should be most fully reflected in the work of local soviets. The improvement of democracy, Yu.V. Andropov has told us, requires the elimination of anything that numbs or undermines the initiative of the masses and discourages creative thought and vigorous action on the part of the laboring public.

But the collective principle certainly does not preclude PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY and, in fact, presupposes it. COLLECTIVE WORK MEANS THAT EACH WORKER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR HIS OWN DUTIES AND CARRIES THEM OUT INDEPENDENTLY WITH A VIEW TO THE COLLECTIVE OPINION. The broad-scale publicizing of decisions is a guarantee of their depth and competence.

How can we even discuss the work of some local soviets when the actions of their ispolkoms are confined to the mere issuance of information -- and, for that matter, they sometimes cannot even do this correctly -- or when certain workers concern themselves with personal matters during work hours and so forth? Of course, this testifies to a lack of incentive and initiative, without which any organ loses its meaning and image.

Who should be concerned about the activity of soviets if not the soviets themselves? After all, there is no higher authority on the local level. The people have entrusted everything to the soviets. Perhaps not all soviets are capable of solving all problems, but they can and must consider any problem which deserves consideration. They must consider them and seek solutions.

I feel that V.I. Lenin's response to a letter from the Presidium of the Moscow Soviet of Workers and Red Army Deputies is pertinent in this connection. In response to the phrase "the Presidium has had to relieve itself of the responsibility...", Lenin wrote: "This is done by capricious young ladies, and not by adult politicians. You will not relieve yourselves of responsibility but will triple it."

Soviet organs are responsible for literally everything. For this reason, bureaucratism and attempts to obscure matters, delay decisions or transfer the burden to others are inadmissible in their work. If there are signs of this in their work, they are immediately apparent to people and give rise to severe criticism. Many complaints about the work of ispolkoms have been received by us in the Central Committee and in other organs and have been reported in newspapers and on television. Comrades, please take this into account. Whenever the complaint is valid and is not given the necessary attention by local organs, we will take stern actions.

Now that the movement for high discipline is spreading throughout the country, we repeat -- EACH EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MUST BE A MODEL OF EXECUTIVE DISCIPLINE! The reinforcement of the soviets' CONTROL FUNCTIONS will be particularly important in this connection. This presupposes control over the implementation of their own decisions and the decisions of other organs.

It will also be important to strengthen the unity of state control with public, or people's control. This combination is the best indication of the class nature of our state. The matter in question is the relationship of soviets to their subordinate organs of people's control -- with the most popular controlling organs in our country. Local soviets can do much to heighten the effectiveness of their control. This can include reports at sessions, the coordinated work of standing commissions and organs of people's control and reciprocal information.

A study of the work of the Tkibuli city committee of people's control proved that the great potential of people's control organs is not being utilized to the maximum everywhere. Inspections here are conducted sporadically, are often superficial and do not produce any specific results. The work is not systematic in the least and does not display any principled action.

This is why local soviets must work with the republic Committee of People's Control to strengthen its organs in cities and rayons and must aid in heightening the effectiveness of its groups and stations at enterprises and organizations. Other organs of control should also work productively.

Joint work by soviets with trade-union, Komsomol and other public organizations has a significant socioeconomic and political impact. THIS COULD AFFORD CONSIDERABLE OPPORTUNITIES TO STRENGTHEN OUR SOCIETY'S POLITICAL SYSTEM.

IV

The prestige and authority of the soviets represent the authority of the entire Soviet regime. For this reason, our party has no objective more important and more crucial than the comprehensive reinforcement of the soviets. THE PARTY MANAGEMENT OF SOVIETS IS A CPSU POLICY-PLANNING OBJECTIVE.

The party has always concerned itself with improving the work of all links of soviets and has consistently and persistently taken extensive measures to improve various facets of their activity, expand their rights, reinforce democratic principles in their work and develop legislation.

Quite often, however, our party committees substitute for local soviets and usurp their functions -- this is no secret to anyone. Why should we try to hide the facts?

Sometimes even we in the Central Committee are guilty of serious "sins." Although we consciously did this at one time in the republic, it was because we had no other alternative, but today this approach is completely unwarranted. It is extremely important, as speakers pointed out at the June plenum, TO SECURE THE CORRECT DISTRIBUTION OF FUNCTIONS AMONG PARTY AND STATE ORGANS. This is totally consistent with Lenin's demand that the party should strive to DIRECT the activities of soviets, but not to replace them. Regardless of how active our party organizations might be, unsatisfactory work by soviets is evidence of the INADEQUATE POLITICAL WORK of our party committees.

On the whole, the activities of local soviets are being directed successfully by the Tbilisi and Poti gorkoms and the Zestafonskiy, Tskhakayevskiy, Zugdidskiy, Makharadzevskiy, Goriyskiy, Kvarelskiy, Tsulukidzevskiy, Samtredskiy, Khashurskiy and Gulripshskiy party raykoms. In the Tianetskiy Raykom, on the other hand, this work has not been apparent until recently.

Soviet organs display a certain degree of passivity in Akhmetskiy, Tsiteltskaroykiy, Kazbegskiy and some other rayons.

Recently our comrades investigated the work of the Sachkerskiy party raykom with soviet personnel in line with the decisions of the 17th plenum. Many shortcomings were discovered. The party raykom does not work with the personnel reserve, there is no plan, and the subject matter of discussions is not defined precisely. Such effective methods of heightening the responsibility of soviet personnel as the presentation of reports at bureau meetings are not being used, contacts with primary party organizations are weak, and so forth.

Moreover, workers in some rayispolkom offices have committed crimes. District inspector Bliadze brutally murdered the father of four children. The sum of 126,000 rubles was confiscated from the office of rayon chief vehicle inspector Turkadze. A Volga GAZ-24 automobile, registered under a different name, was also confiscated. Is it possible that none of the administrators of the party raykom and rayispolkom or bureau members knew the real Bliadze and Turkadze? And if they did not, the implications are even worse. This means that neither the raykom nor the rayispolkom knows anything about its personnel and their professional and moral qualities.

Of course, we have cited the most striking examples to prove that much remains to be changed and improved in the party management of soviets and in our work with soviet personnel. On the whole, however, it is quite apparent that soviet personnel have matured perceptibly as a result of improvements in management and of the advances made in the republic in recent years.

THE HEAD OF ANY SOVIET IS A GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL AND HE MUST ALWAYS BEAR THIS IN MIND AND REALIZE ALL OF THE POWER AND RESPONSIBILITY OF HIS POSITION.

We need genuinely enthusiastic people in the soviets, we need born leaders who can motivate the people. Today many chairmen of local soviets are genuine statesmen, and we regard this as a natural feature of our socialist order.

We must always keep an eye on the work of local soviets. The correct party management of the soviets and the encouragement of good work by soviets on all levels must be secured in the Central Committee and on the level of party oblast, city and rayon committees. The chairmen of ispolkoms on all levels should be invited to meet with the Central Committee more frequently and to work in Central Committee departments, particularly the Department for Organizational Party Work. I am not even mentioning the Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers, where this should be a matter of course and where this kind of work should be conducted literally each day.

Soviet personnel should be instilled with a highly internationalist spirit. This is one side of the matter. On the other, THEY SHOULD CARRY THE HIGH IDEALS OF FRIENDSHIP AND FRATERNITY AMONG PEOPLES, THE IDEALS OF INTERNATIONALISM AND SOVIET PATRIOTISM INTO THE MASSES.

Special emphasis should be placed on the soviets' responsible role in THE FURTHER IMPROVEMENT OF MILITARY-PATRIOTIC INDOCTRINATION AND THE REINFORCEMENT OF OUR GREAT MOTHERLAND'S DEFENSIVE CAPABILITIES. This must be their vital concern because it is consistent with the wishes of millions of Soviet laborers. We leaders often have to meet with people and talk to them. We know of the recent difficulties in the provision of our laborers with some food products and we know how acute the housing problem is in the republic. People have thousands of other daily concerns. Nevertheless, when we meet with them the main topic of discussion is the need to preserve world peace and prevent a new world war.

The Communist Party and Soviet Government are willing to take any positive steps in this direction and have corroborated this willingness with numerous actions. Nevertheless, a great deal today also depends on each of us individually, because now that American imperialism has started a new round of the arms race the most important condition for the maintenance of balance in the world is the constant reinforcement of our state's defensive might and the heightened political vigilance and discipline of all citizens.

For our republic this demand is made all the more crucial by its responsibility to defend the southern borders of our Soviet motherland. We must not forget that dozens of the aggressive NATO bloc's most modern military bases are located right next door, in Turkey. Have we done everything within our power to keep up with this responsibility?

Unfortunately, we have not. In some regions there are many parasites and so-called "shirkers." Furthermore, this applies to border regions. People violate passport regulations and are absent from their place of residence for months at a time without informing the proper military commissariats and other agencies of their whereabouts. Village and rural soviets must keep a close watch on reservists and give military commissariats constant assistance.

The reinforcement of the country's defensive capabilities is closely related to concern for our glorious armed forces and for their soldiers and officers, who guard our peaceful labor day and night, in all types of weather. Local administrators should take a constant interest in the conditions of their daily life and find out if they have any problems with water and heat supplies and other services. They should visit troop subunits more frequently and make certain that they are receiving fresh fruit and vegetables. After all, we have the ability to help our courageous soldiers and officers so that they will always sense the paternal concern of the entire republic population and all administrators. Here as well, the soviets will have to take more direct and purposeful action.

All of this provides more evidence of the need for REGULAR AND SYSTEMATIC ANALYSES OF ALL FACETS OF SOVIET ACTIVITY. In this area we must arm ourselves with innovations in the work of the republic party organization, such as the systemic analysis of the activities of each party gorkom and raykom to coordinate organizational work, ideological indoctrination and economic management for the coming year. The results of these analyses are discussed by Central Committee secretaries and then at a plenum. This method is now being widely used by local party committees in their dealings with primary links.

Obviously, it would also be wise for the republic Council of Ministers and Supreme Soviet Presidium to institute this kind of annual comprehensive analysis of the activities of oblast, city and rayon soviets of people's deputies, and for these, in

turn, to extend this practice to the lower links of local soviets. The result would be the constant thorough and specific analysis of the activities of soviet organs so that shortcomings could be discovered and eliminated before they have accumulated and created extremely serious problems.

Our discussion has reaffirmed the need for the continued development of the SCIENTIFIC-ANALYTICAL BASES OF PARTY AND SOVIET CONSTRUCTION. In this area, we expect a great deal from our leading social science institutes and VUZ departments, the new republic Center for the Advanced Training of Party, Soviet and Economic Personnel and our renowned social scientists. I think that the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and departments of the Central Committee should begin serious work in this area and find the right approach to many problems.

Have the distinctive features of soviet activity in the agroindustrial complex been analyzed sufficiently in our republic? After all, this is a field of hundreds of questions and thousands of nuances, including legal implications. Or let us consider such topics as the soviets and the development of industrial production in rural areas, the soviets and the expansion of economic democracy, the soviets and cultural construction and many others. All of them are awaiting qualified analysis. It is time to issue the appropriate orders, draw up explicit assignments and make up the exact schedules for the analytical and practical investigation of these extremely important and complex problems.

The USSR Constitution grants each Soviet citizen the broadest rights and freedoms and also imposes certain obligations. ACHIEVING THE OPTIMAL COMBINATION OF THE INTERESTS OF EACH INDIVIDUAL WITH PUBLIC, STATEWIDE INTERESTS AND THEREBY DIRECTING THE POWERFUL CONSTRUCTIVE ENERGY OF OUR PEOPLE -- THIS IS THE PRIMARY FUNCTION, DUTY AND OBLIGATION OF THE SOVIETS!

Our meeting, Comrades, is coming to an end. It has convinced us that such meetings are extremely useful to all of us and must be made traditional and be held regularly, once every year or every 2 years, so that we can make a collective assessment of the results of local soviet activity, as we do in other spheres, and oversee the implementation of recommendations.

Local soviets perform many important functions. They bear the entire burden of public administration on the lowest level, and this is of great educative value. We have noted how their administrators have matured, have gained a broader outlook and are performing a broader range of functions. On the day before this meeting, extremely interesting and useful gatherings were held in ministries and departments. I want you to know that these comrades said that the heads of local soviets and the deputies are highly erudite and knowledgeable.

The majority are honest people who are devoted to the cause and who serve the party and the people faithfully. There is no question that local soviets, soviet personnel and all deputies, all of you, must be given much of the credit for the successes and serious positive advances in the republic in recent years. Dear Comrades, I would like to convey the most heartfelt gratitude of the Georgian CP Central Committee Bureau to you for your difficult but honored work and for your contribution to economic and cultural construction. I want to sincerely thank each of you and your colleagues, all of the deputies, and wish you happiness, good health, all the best and the prosperity of your rural communities and cities, our entire republic and our entire great motherland!

SHEVARDNADZE ADDRESSES SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL

WAO80230 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 22 Sep 83 pp 1-2

[Speech by First Secretary Eduard Amvros'yevich Shevardnadze of the Georgian CP Central Committee, candidate for membership in the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, at extended session of republic Coordinating Council for Science and Technological Progress in Gagra on 16 September: "We Must Conserve and Compound the Wealth of Our Native Land!"; capitalized passages published in boldface]

[Text] Comrades!

You have probably noticed that the resolution of all the major issues we have been concerned with in recent years has generally been connected with the introduction of scientific and technical achievements and that this is the most justifiable and effective approach. This is a significant fact and it proves conclusively that **TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS, PARTICULARLY AFTER THE SIXTH PLENUM OF THE GEORGIAN CP CENTRAL COMMITTEE, IS MAKING ITS WAY INTO THE MOST DIVERSE SPHERES OF REPUBLIC LIFE MORE AND MORE DIRECTLY AND INTENSIVELY.**

It is from the vantage point of the acceleration of technological progress that we discuss, for example, the need to heighten labor productivity, to improve product quality and so forth. In our opinion, it is also quite natural that the agenda of today's session of the republic Coordinating Council for Science and Technological Progress includes some pertinent aspects of a major universal issue -- environmental protection and, in particular, ways of guarding the Black Sea basin and coastline against careless and flagrant tampering.

The technological revolution is naturally connected with the resolution of ecological problems because it affects them in two ways. On the one hand, it is precisely this revolution that lies at the basis of the industrialization that is exacerbating ecological problems. On the other, today's ecological problems can be solved successfully only through the active use of scientific and technical achievements.

Extremely favorable objective conditions for this exist in our country because environmental protection has achieved the status of state policy. Do the major projects undertaken to protect Lake Baykal against pollution, to control and stabilize the level of the Caspian Sea, to regenerate Lake Sevan and many others not testify to the successful and protective combination of a scientific approach to this problem with planned socialist management? Tens, hundreds and thousands of examples could be cited. These are cases in which conservation measures are completely coordinated with the scales and nature of industrialization projects.

This approach is extremely important in our republic, where population density is six times as high and the area of plowland per inhabitant is only one-sixth as high as the union average. Nature in our republic, which has inspired so many famous writers, poets, artists and musicians, is not only majestic and beautiful but is also easily wounded. It is sensitive to anything that goes against its laws.

You know how quickly industry and other branches of the national economy have been developing in our republic in recent years and you know that volumes of capital construction are growing perceptibly. It is due primarily to our purposeful efforts to improve ecological conditions that this has not inflicted any noticeable damage on nature. These are matters of constant concern to the republic party organization and government, and the current session of the coordinating council can also be regarded as proof of this.

Our republic was one of the first in which a State Committee for the Protection of Nature was created. The appropriate departments were set up in Gosplan, several

sectorial ministries and departments and some large enterprises. We are striving for the periodic discussion of the results of conservation activity by republic administrators and the entire party and economic aktiv at the most diverse gatherings, including republic CP congresses, central committee plenums, various conferences and science symposiums and others.

I would like to say a few words about the results of this work at this session of the coordinating council. To some degree, almost all research and experimental design institutes are working on ecological projects. The use of this great creative potential is of particular concern to us.

If we look at the QUANTITATIVE SIDE of the matter, we naturally see the substantial growth of capital investments in conservation and the more extensive construction of large engineering and technical facilities. Last year, for example, capital investments totaled 52 million rubles. This was more than double the indicator of the first year of the 10th 5-Year Plan and was much higher than indicators for all other years.

Significant QUALITATIVE ADVANCES include the change in the very attitude of our economic managers toward environmental protection, their active personal participation in this work and the enlistment of the services of scientists and specialists to solve new problems. These advances, for example, made it possible to stop the pollution of the atmosphere by the Zestafoni Ferro-Alloy Plant. But after all, people had reconciled themselves to this for dozens of years, as they did to the pollution of the Kvirila River and, in essence, of the entire Black Sea basin and to the waste products of the Chiatura Mining Combine. Today these major problems, which were of vital importance to all West Georgia, have essentially been solved. And this, I can say without fear, is a historic event in our republic.

Just as many other measures, these were carried out in accordance with the recommendations of an applied science conference held a few years ago and attended by the republic party and economic aktiv and the most prominent Soviet scientists and specialists. Therefore, consistency and a comprehensive goal-oriented approach can be seen more and more clearly in the area of conservation. It was of particular significance that THE RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED AT THE CONFERENCE WERE LATER APPROVED BY A PLENUM OF THE GEORGIAN CP CENTRAL COMMITTEE, AND THEY ARE STILL PERTINENT TO US AND ARE REGARDED BY US AS A POLICY-PLANNING DOCUMENT. I think that we should refer to these decisions more frequently.

The problems connected with environmental protection include some which are quite obviously urgent, which can be seen literally by the naked eye and which will brook absolutely no delay. One of these is the need to prevent the pollution of the Black Sea and of its entire unique coastline.

This is a major piece of national property, and I am not referring to our republic. The Black Sea coast of the Caucasus has long been compared to the pearl. And it is true that its favorable climate, picturesque spots, unique natural wonders and many mineral and therapeutic springs have turned it into one of our country's largest and most popular health centers and an internationally renowned resort area.

It is no secret that the opinions of millions of Soviet people and foreign tourists about our republic, its successes in economic and cultural construction and our culture in general are based largely on their acquaintance with our coastal region, and this gives us a special responsibility. We have stressed repeatedly that EXEMPLARY ORDER must reign throughout this zone, that we need only EXEMPLARY resorts and health care establishments and EXEMPLARY enterprises and farms here, and that work in the service sphere and other branches must be EXEMPLARY here.

This means, of course, that ALL CONSERVATION ACTIVITY ON THE BLACK SEA COAST SHOULD BE CONDUCTED ON THE LEVEL OF THE LATEST ACHIEVEMENTS OF WORLD SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.

The recent effective steps in this direction deserve mention. We are taking a more thorough and serious look at marine ecological problems. This was reaffirmed by the speeches presented today by our comrades at this session of the coordinating council. Local party, soviet and economic organs and the general public are being encouraged to take an interest in this matter. The prevention of the pollution of the Black Sea with industrial waste, the purification and disposal of sewage, the prevention of coastal erosion -- this is far from a complete list of the problems and issues that are matters of constant concern to the Georgian CP Central Committee, the republic government and our oblast, city and rayon party committees.

The work is being conducted quite intensively. The sewer systems in 10 cities in West Georgia were equipped with purification installations during the 10th 5-Year Plan and the first 2 years of the 11th. As a result, the amount of unpurified sewage entering the Black Sea basin has been reduced by more than half.

Many industrial enterprises in coastal cities are being equipped with sewage treatment units, our ports are being re-equipped and the technology of port operations is being renewed and improved. All of this has considerably reduced the pollution of the sea with industrial waste.

It is in the coastal zone that many new methods of organizing and conducting conservation activity are tested. This gives rise to serious discussions and speculation, particularly since several problems are still extremely acute and many shortcomings still exist. I agree with Comrade V.Ya. Kacharava, chairman of the State Committee for the Protection of Nature, that we must return to the problem of purification equipment, devote one of these meetings to the discussion of this problem and take a serious look at it from all sides.

The efforts to combat coastal erosion are not always completely sound or thoroughly considered. But this is probably one of our most urgent problems today, and it therefore calls for detailed discussion.

The development of the Black Sea coast as a resort area and its great popularity are due largely to its wide sand and pebble beaches, which are not only an essential element of organized human recreation but also serve as a natural means of regulating the interaction of the sea and land. Over the last few decades, however, the Black Sea coast, particularly in some places, has deteriorated to an extremely unsatisfactory, simply catastrophic state.

What are the reasons for this? After all, during these years some work was conducted to protect the coastline. Our comrades have cited these data: Between 1961 and 1981 more than 80 million rubles was spent on the construction of coastal reinforcement structures. This does not sound like a small sum, but during the same period the eroded shoreline grew from 155 to 220 kilometers. In other words, almost two-thirds of the republic's coastline is already being eroded. During the same period, more than a thousand hectares of coastal territory was washed away, including 60 hectares in the Gagra zone, 80 hectares near Ochamchira, 280 hectares near Poti and so forth. The village of Adliya near Batumi, some residential neighborhoods in Poti and Ochamchira and other areas are now under water. Utility lines, buildings and installations, including shore support structures, have been destroyed. As you can see, the situation is extremely bad.

The reason is that the interaction of the sea and land has been particularly intense, and any errors and rash actions are therefore liable to have serious and immediate consequences. Many important aspects of marine ecology were overlooked for many years. They simply were not given enough attention.

ONE OF THE MAIN REASONS FOR THE INTENSIVE EROSION OF THE BLACK SEA COAST IS THE ACTIVE AND UNREASONED ECONOMIC ACTIVITY IN THE REGION.

It has already been established that the stability of the republic coast depends on the alluvium brought in by waves. But until just recently almost all construction organizations preferred to acquire building material from riverbeds or even from the seashore rather than from quarries. Their actions were dictated by so-called economic considerations. It is no secret that all of the postwar construction of cities, health resorts, the black sea railway, highways and so forth was conducted essentially on the basis of cheap marine rubble. But after all, it has now been calculated that each 150,000-200,000 cubic meters of rubble is equivalent to 1 kilometer of wide beach with a good surf.

The race for this kind of immediate so-called economy could absolutely ruin us, Comrades. We must be able to act in accordance with the state interest and strive for real, and not imaginary, savings.

I am mentioning all of this because some people are still hunting for cheap inert materials, in spite of the decree of the republic Council of Ministers which has put an almost republicwide ban on the extraction of sand and pebbles from riverbeds in West Georgia and from the seashore. And what is particularly disturbing, these hunters sometimes act with the tacit consent, and even the connivance, of the heads of local party and soviet organs.

The republic People's Control Committee discovered 16 incidents of the predatory extraction of sand and gravel from the Black Sea shore and riverbeds in West Georgia by subdivisions of the republic ministries of rural construction, highways and construction and by other organizations just during 3 days in June of this year.

The Poti Construction Department of the Gruzgeologiya Repair and Construction Administration was excavating sand with a Belarus' dredge from a beach in the Maltakva region, near Poti, and it continued to do this even after fines had been imposed. But is this simply a matter of fines? Is it possible that these comrades do not realize that the beach is unique? How dare they!

The quarries with known deposits of inert materials which are specially allocated to ministries and departments are often not used. Comrade I.K. Gogitidze, chief of the Gruzgeologiya Administration, was right to bring up this matter. For example, only 11 of the 22 known sand and gravel deposits in West Georgia are being exploited.

Law enforcement agencies in the republic should respond more harshly to the predatory treatment of valuable natural resources by some organizations, particularly when this behavior goes further than the extraction of inert materials. Since the subject has already come up, I must discuss the negative habit, which I could even call outright barbarism, of poaching in the broad sense of the term. We do not seem to be able to put an end to this evil.

Georgia is one of the richest republics in terms of water resources. Our comrades cited figures and made calculations today. But we have very little fish and all of you know that the problem of providing our population with fish products is being solved too slowly. Of course, mismanagement, water pollution and other factors must bear much of the blame, but the absolutely barbarous treatment of this rich national resource by certain categories of people, who are unscrupulously destroying this resource by indulging in poaching, is equally to blame. In Gardabanskiy, Marneulskiy, Bolnisskiy, Dmanisskiy, Kaspskiy, Mtskhetskiy, Khashurskiy and Zugdidskiy Rayons, in Poti and in some other parts of the republic, poaching is being practiced on such a huge scale that it is virtually nullifying all efforts to protect and reproduce fish resources.

The same is true of our hunting areas and of the observance of hunting laws. Furthermore, the laws are often violated precisely by those who are bound by their professional duties to preserve our flora and fauna -- the real wealth of our nation.

Our comrades have cited some facts. Between 1976 and 1980 more than 35,000 cases of poaching and violations of fishing and hunting laws were discovered in the republic. In other words, this is already being practiced on a mass scale. Poachers and violators were charged around half a million rubles in fines and damages, but money alone cannot always compensate for the injuries suffered by nature.

We are extremely dissatisfied with the work of some of our services. The republic has a broad network of state hunting inspection agencies of the Georgian SSR Ministry of the Forestry Industry and state fishing inspection agencies of Gruzcherrybvod, which employ hundreds of people. The Ministry of Internal Affairs has similar agencies and there are voluntary societies. But they are not doing much for the actual protection of flora and fauna. In any case, they do not seem to be doing much.

I must say quite frankly that the people who destroy our nature, deform it and treat the natural resources of our republic and our entire country in a predatory manner are enemies of their people. I cannot call them anything else. And they should be treated like common criminals.

On the one hand, we must teach people to care about nature and to love it; we must teach them when they are children, when they are in school or even in kindergarten. On the other, we must impose harsh penalties on those who flagrantly encroach on national property. Leniency is particularly unacceptable in the republic's unique natural areas, such as the Black Sea coast and other sites of rare beauty.

The CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Government are sparing no sums in aiding us. Logging, for example, has essentially been stopped in the Abkhaz ASSR and in some other parts of the country. Of course, transporting raw materials from distant regions is not cheap, but the forests of the Abkhaz ASSR are of unique value to our entire country. This makes it even more imperative that we RESPOND IN A PRINCIPLED MANNER TO ALL VIOLATIONS, WHETHER THEY ARE COMMITTED BY A PRIVATE INDIVIDUAL OR BY A STATE ORGANIZATION.

The proposal of the People's Control Committee, regarding the amendment of environmental protection legislation so that criminal proceedings can be instituted against the managers of enterprises and organizations engaging in the illegal excavation of sand and gravel from the Black Sea shore and riverbeds in West Georgia and so that the equipment and vehicles used in the predatory extraction of inert materials can be confiscated for the use of the conservation service, should probably be given serious consideration. Ministers and heads of departments should be personally accountable to the Georgian CP Central Committee in such cases.

The shortage of alluvium, which is resulting in coastal erosion, is also connected with the construction of sea ports, changes in the hydrological features of rivers, including the changes arising from the erection of hydroelectric power stations, the development of irrigation and water supply systems and so forth. In these cases we generally put the blame on miscalculations in project plans. But frankly speaking, how could they be miscalculations if they are usually known to specialists but are deliberately ignored, and always for the same reason -- in the hope of lowering construction costs? In these cases, costs are not cut through the use of original designs, but in a much simpler way -- by ignoring everything that lies outside the bounds of the limited departmental outlook.

THE NARROW DEPARTMENTAL APPROACH IS THE SECOND REASON WHY EROSION CANNOT BE STOPPED ON THE BLACK SEA COAST AND WHY THE NECESSARY COMPREHENSIVE MEASURES HAVE NOT BEEN TAKEN.

For example, the Tbilgidroproyekt Institute -- today we heard a speech by its director, Comrade A.D. Chitanava -- was appointed the general project planner of the Inguri GES by the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification. It was also supposed to determine the scales of the possible negative environmental impact of the construction and to plan certain measures in this area, including measures to protect the seashore. In other words, the comrades knew all and foresaw all. Nevertheless, the GES was built long ago, but no planning estimates have been approved for the protection of coastal territory near the mouth of the Inguri River and the Inguri GES canal, although costly coastal and maritime research and investigations were conducted for 20 years. This approach is unacceptable and is contrary to the demands of the party Central Committee.

Recently the republic press, especially ZARYA VOSTOKA, criticized the institute and some specific comrades. And it was right! Everyone should know who is to blame for the damage suffered by the coastline, particularly the unique spot of Anakliya. We are certain that the current administration of the Tbilgidroproyekt Institute and the administrators of the Georgian SSR Main Administration for Power and Electrification will draw the proper conclusions from this criticism and will finally take a more active stand on this matter and other matters of this kind.

Finally, it is important to learn all the facts: Tomorrow we will be building even more, so that we can keep in step with scientific and technical progress. This means that ministries and departments whose construction projects will have a negative effect on the environment in general and the stability of coastal territory in particular should bear the cost of eliminating undesirable ecological consequences. This will heighten their responsibility for environmental protection and, in our opinion, will force them to take a different approach to some questions connected with economy and thrift and to act in the interests of the state.

Some of the people here today are ministers and the administrators of departments, large associations, enterprises and construction organizations. Please remember that we are not trying to disturb you. Everything we have said is in accordance with the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee and is consistent with existing environmental protection legislation in our country.

Of course, it is already too late to blame anyone, but I must say that, unfortunately, this legislation was virtually ignored during the 25 years of the existence of the republic seacoast protection service. We did not give any serious consideration to the degree of ministerial and departmental participation in the financing of coastal reinforcement operations. Now they are complaining that the construction of installations has already been completed, estimated costs have been exceeded and no more funds can be obtained. As a result, coastal reinforcement operations on the Black Sea coast are being financed mainly with the extremely limited and meager amounts allocated to the republic for the development of public utilities.

In general, the allocation of funds will be of little help if departmental and regional attitudes cannot be overcome. For example, the Ministry of Railways conducts coastal reinforcement operations with a single goal in mind -- to guarantee uninterrupted train traffic. I would like the comrades present here today to acknowledge that the results of these efforts are far from promising. The trunkline has been moved inland several times, there are still frequent delays or stoppages of train traffic, many coastal spots of value by virtue of their natural conditions and climate have been turned into heaps of rocks and concrete rubble, and the landscape has been disfigured. What we saw yesterday was simply horrifying. How can people look at this calmly? Or are our comrades looking in another direction? At first it seems a paradox, but it is a fact that the coastal sections along the Batumi-Kobuleti and Gantiadi-Gagra routes, where shore reinforcement work has been conducted longer and more intensively than in other places, are in the worst state.

The situation is no better along urban and resort territories. But the coastal sections between reinforced municipal and railway installations, which are used mainly for agriculture, are in a particularly pitiful state. The Ministry of Agriculture has never conducted any kind of coastal reinforcement work and has not even kept records of the land washed away by waves each year. Others have had to calculate the losses, and the figures are astounding. During just one storm in 1981, the Gagrskiy Vegetable Sovkhoz lost a 50-meter strip of irrigated land and the Pitsunda Poultry Factory lost a 90-meter strip. Galskiy Rayon annually loses 12-15 hectares of coastal area. But after all, this land is priceless!

We hope that the republic's new State Committee for Agricultural Production, which is represented at our meeting by Comrade R.D. Pantskhava, its first deputy chairman, will be able to take a more specific approach to this problem.

The time has come to discuss THE THIRD EXTREMELY IMPORTANT REASON FOR THE NEGLIGIBLE IMPACT OF MEASURES TO PROTECT THE BLACK SEA COAST -- SO-CALLED NONSPECIALIZED TECHNOCRACY.

For decades, some ministries and departments conducted shore reinforcement work only near facilities under their jurisdiction, which compounded the disruption of natural coast formation. Yesterday we saw the results of this narrow departmental approach with our own eyes. Local reinforcements, which are usually costly hydraulic structures, have a number of negative side-effects, particularly the increased erosion of nearby areas, the replacement of natural beaches with concrete, the disfigurement of the natural landscape and others. Structures should be built, but this should only be done on a solid scientific foundation, after a comprehensive investigation of each specific case.

Sometimes coastal destruction has been so catastrophic that it has attracted nationwide attention, as was the case on Cape Pitsunda in 1969. Experts from USSR Gosstroy seriously considered moving resort buildings far inland, and the problem of protecting Capt Pitsunda was investigated by 40 organizations with different departmental affiliations and specialties in Moscow, Leningrad, Odessa, Sochi, Tbilisi and other cities.

Technocracy was also apparent in the fact that until 1981 the head organizations which actually made policy in the area of coastal protection were establishments concerned more with engineering than with nature. Many of them specialized in fields far removed from these problems and, at best, felt that they could be solved through the standardization or modification of hydraulic structures. They were incapable of taking any other approach.

In this way, in spite of the fact that this was a common problem, that fairly sound recommendations had been made and that some practical experience had been accumulated in this area, the lack of coordination and scientific depth prevented the attainment of perceptible results for many years. This means that fundamentally new decisions were required on the very approach to marine ecological problems and on organizational matters.

The Black Sea coast of the Abkhaz and Adzhar ASSR's and of Georgia as a whole is the common property of the entire Soviet nation and our entire laboring public. Realizing this, republic directive organs joined representatives of USSR Gosplan, USSR Gosstroy, the USSR and Georgian SSR Academies of Sciences and the union and republic State Committees for Science and Technology in a thorough investigation of the present state of affairs and concluded that ONE OF THE REASONS FOR THE UNSATISFACTORY STATE OF THE COASTLINE IS THE ABSENCE OF A SINGLE COMPETENT ORGAN, CAPABLE OF ORGANIZING AND DIRECTING THE WORK OF RESEARCH, PROJECT PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION ORGANIZATIONS IN THE INVESTIGATION OF COASTAL PROCESSES AND THE PERFORMANCE OF COASTAL REINFORCEMENT WORK.

The Gruzmorberegozashchita Scientific Production Association was created in the republic for this purpose in 1981. Its duties include the performance of the entire cycle of work, from the study of Black Sea coast dynamics to the struggle against the advancing sea. I think that this is the only correct approach.

Special mention should be made of the substantial support offered by USSR Gosplan and its administrators, including Comrade N.K. Baybakov himself, Comrade V.Ye. Biryukov, his deputy, and other division heads -- Comrades V.V. Prusov and N.N. Baryshnikov -- as well as Comrade Yu.L. Demidov, chief of a subdivision, workers from the USSR Ministry of Finance and other comrades who realized the importance of this matter and immediately put their trust in the idea of a scientific production association. The necessary capital investments, transport vehicles and machinery were allocated. We are still enjoying their active and eager support.

We are grateful to our journalists. We were quite soundly supported by PRAVDA newspaper, where Comrade G.I. Lebanidze wrote one of his interesting articles, OGONEK and SOVETSKIY SOYUZ magazines and the central television network. Their coverage of the matter aided in the establishment of the new organization and the enhancement of its professional authority.

A significant contribution was also made by the republic press, television and radio, the scientific community and the creative public, on whose behalf our well-known writer Chabua Amiredzhibi made such a convincing speech today.

In fact, the very creation of this association marked the beginning of a FUNDAMENTALLY NEW STAGE in the work to guard the Black Sea coast against erosion, and possibly in all of our conservation efforts. We must not be too hasty with general conclusions, but the specific results of what has been done should be analyzed, and the time has come for a precise assessment of the first steps.

First we should note that observations confirmed the accuracy of several hypotheses put forth by association scientists, and within a relatively short period of time that were perceptible and, we could even say, sufficiently convincing results. The 50-meter sand and pebble coastal strip restored by association subdivisions near the cities of Gagra and Batumi, the settlement of Pitsunda and the mouths of the Gumista and Kelasuri Rivers proved that their coastal protection methods were highly effective and economical and confirmed the high standards of association projects and plans. This was the main result.

It is interesting that until just recently the republic government had to publish up to 10 decrees and directives each year on the correction of injuries inflicted by storms. Since last year, NOT ONE SUCH DECISION HAS BEEN MADE, although the weather service has recorded storms that were much more severe than, for instance, the storms of 1980 and 1981.

Today the scientific production association has made it possible to unite the efforts of not only various services, but also essentially all of the prominent scientists and specialists in the field of coastal protection. All of them are eagerly making suggestions and implementing their ideas.

In our opinion, our comrades have started this work on a broad scale and are taking a sound and serious approach to it. An extensive program of measures covering the period up to the year 2000 has already been drawn up. This comprehensive approach with a view to the distant future is absolutely valid. I think that this program should be discussed by the leaders of the republic and all interested organizations. The cost of protecting the average kilometer of seashore will now be half as high as before. This is the kind of economy that should be encouraged in every way possible because productive scientific thought lies at its basis.

Our comrades have correctly pointed out the need for the same kind of approach to the study of river basins, the regulation of run-off and the reinforcement of banks. The republic suffers considerable damages from floods and droughts. This is also a universal social problem, and it can even be called a political one, and it must be solved in the same way as marine ecological problems.

The main objective, according to scientists, is THE SELF-REGULATED INTERACTION OF SEA AND LAND, which can be achieved through the artificial balancing of the input and output of coastal pumps and the sharp reduction of volumes of shore reinforcement construction. This will also reduce expenditures of scarce construction materials considerably. Comrade G.Z. Mirianashvili, chairman of the republic Gosstroy, mentioned a figure -- a million tons of cement a year. Even if it were slightly lower, this is still a tremendous and, what is most important, real savings in view of our dimensions.

In short, the decision to create a connecting link between work cycles and individual departments in the form of the Gruzmorbergozashchita Scientific Production Association (of course, a shorter name could be coined for it) turned out to be quite timely and effective on the whole. But the new organization must be reinforced and its authority and material and technical potential must be augmented.

Past experience has proved that limited funds cannot produce the necessary impact in the struggle against erosion and are essentially wasted. We are throwing money to the winds. We must secure the financing of the complete cycle of work and conduct it on a broader scale.

This again brings up the subject of participation by interested ministries, departments, union enterprises, health resorts located within the 3-kilometer coastal zone and some production and industrial facilities.

Comrade A.A. Shushanashvili, minister of justice, is present at our meeting. The exact responsibilities of organizations located in this zone must be defined. If for some reason they show no interest in the seacoast or concern, specific measures should be taken: They can be influenced with the aid of administrative or financial leverage, facilities posing a threat to nature might even be closed down temporarily or turned over to other organizations, and so forth. Let us consider all proposals and, if the need arises, let us submit them to union organs and the national government for consideration.

Specific ways of encouraging enterprises to contribute resources to this work should be analyzed. We feel that most of these resources should be concentrated precisely in Gruzmorbergozashchita. And there is no need for postponements. Some departments will not be able to allocate large sums immediately. The main thing is the very principle of participation. EVERYONE MUST BE TAUGHT TO FEEL RESPONSIBLE FOR THE STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

The problem of the preservation and reproduction of the Black Sea coast in Georgia should be thoroughly investigated by Gosplan, the Ministry of Finance, Gosstroy, the State Committee for Science and Technology, the Trade-Union Council and other organizations. It is true that our comrades are quite active even today, but I would like to point out that Gruzmorbergozashchita is a new organization and is not known to everyone, particularly in the nation at large. This means that the association has an acute need for tangible support and assistance in the resolution of some problems. This is particularly true in view of the fact that it has to maintain contact with more than 80 ministries, departments and organizations of union, union-republic and republic jurisdiction, having some connection with the problem of protecting the Black Sea coast in Georgia.

The administrators of this association should join Gosplan, the Ministry of Finance, Gosstroy and other organizations to improve the status and structure of the association and create the necessary conditions for a transition to cost accounting. Some proposals have already been made, and there is no need to delay the resolution of these problems.

We have reached a stage at which the doubts about the accuracy of many past decisions have been dispelled. Now it is important to act more boldly and persistently and to go further. Quick and efficient action will promote the effective functioning of the new association. It has been stressed quite accurately that we should arm ourselves with progressive foreign experience as well as domestic experience and we should cooperate with other union republics and fraternal socialist countries. For example, Bulgaria, Romania and other countries have expressed great interest in the protection of the Black Sea coast. The principles of productive cooperation should be defined.

Besides this, association personnel have to take more resolute action in some cases. I want to assure you that you are regarded as extremely qualified, intelligent specialists by the republic Council of Ministers and Central Committee. We feel that Comrade A.G. Kiknadze, general director of the association, has quite skillfully combined the qualities of a good scientist and an expert organizer. He is a communicative man and he knows how to build a relationship with party obkoms and local organs in the same way as with republic and union organizations. We are prepared to support any of your good initiatives and proposals.

The creation of the country's first scientific production association for the protection of the Black Sea coast is a kind of ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIMENT IN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION. It provides for the simultaneous combination of sectorial and territorial interests and the interests of science and production. This is extremely important in the organization of a conservation service.

We consciously promoted the creation of a scientific production association which differs from other associations of this type in terms of its structure and functions: It is not the lowest link of management, but the middle link -- that is, it functions on the level of a republic department and is therefore responsible for the entire matter. The Gruzmorbergozashchita Association is under the direct jurisdiction of the republic Council of Ministers and is an intersectorial organization.

Furthermore, it could be said that this has set a precedent in a scientific-production partnership in which science serves production as a moral, material and administrative guide and dictates its own terms. Of course, this is natural. In this case, science proves quite clearly that it is a direct productive force.

Something else is also quite important: This is the first time that an organization concerned primarily with nature has been assigned the chief role in making decisions on matters connected with environmental protection. This is the first such step, and it proves that this kind of organization must be merged with the national economic complex because this is the only way that science will be able to work out sound and competent recommendations and be developed and enriched. This is extremely important. It is precisely these scientific subdivisions which are concerned primarily with nature that should be in charge of environmental protection and conservation policy and should manage the incorporation of the achievements of related sciences and the engineering sciences.

In this sense, the work experience of Gruzmorbergozashchita deserves the most serious consideration. It should be used more actively, with a view to existing proposals, in some other fields of conservation where the appropriate foundations for this have been laid.

We are convinced that the resolution of these and similar problems on a scientific basis is highly effective. For instance, let us consider a matter of importance to the entire nation and the entire population -- the preservation and restoration of natural and cultural monuments. The establishment of a main scientific production association for their protection and use ensured a sound approach to all questions and the careful and thorough restoration of much of the valuable historical property of ethnic groups living in Georgia.

At present, 100-130 monuments are restored each year. When this matter was discussed by the Secretariat of the Georgian CP Central Committee, Comrade I.N. Tsitsishvili, the association director, showed us slides of some of these before and after their restoration. You know, it was absolutely amazing. How could we not be filled with a sense of the deepest gratitude and respect for the people who have devoted their energy and talent to the performance of this filial duty?

In connection with the coming celebration of the bicentennial of the Georgian Treaty, 37 monuments have been repaired and restored along the Georgian Military Road -- a road symbolizing the indissoluble ties, eternal friendship and fraternity of the Russian and Georgian people.

We attach great significance to the intelligent use of the rich mineral and therapeutic resources of many parts of the republic. A special local resort administration was created for this purpose by the Council of Ministers. We now have a full guarantee that the work connected with the development of local resorts, many of which have unique healing properties, will be put on a solid scientific basis.

The careful and loving treatment of nature depends primarily on the people entrusted with the augmentation of its riches.

And of course, Comrades, it is absolutely intolerable that some scientists, or even entire academic scientific organizations, are ignoring environmental problems. They must take more responsibility and be given more influence in environmental policymaking in state five-year plans.

A great deal depends on the scientists' own attitudes. They can serve as the most authoritative public advocates and representatives of public opinion as well as highly qualified specialists. THE GUARANTEED PRESERVATION OF THE WEALTH OF YOUR LAND, YOUR PEOPLE AND YOUR NATION -- WHAT COULD BE A MORE HONORABLE AND NOBLE CAUSE FOR THE REAL SCIENTIST AND THE GENUINE CITIZEN? This attitude must be fostered in each worker and in each administrator.

How could we fail today to recall the name of one of our most prominent experts in the study of nature, the late Academician Feofan Farneyevich Davitay of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, for whom we all felt such deep respect and love? Or how can we not mention the important contribution made to the preservation of our seacoast by Professor Vsevolod Pavlovich Zenkovich, winner of the Lenin and State Prizes and the head of a laboratory in the Geography Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences? Their personal prestige played a tremendous role, and I could even say the deciding one, in the decision to create the Gruzmorberegozashchita Association. We are so grateful to you, dear Vsevolod Pavlovich!

I would like to talk about another matter which seems to me to be related to nature and to the image of the Black Sea coast. I am referring to THE AESTHETIC LEVEL AND EXTERNAL APPEARANCE OF NEW RESIDENTIAL, PUBLIC AND PRODUCTION BUILDINGS. We need architectural designs which will make each structure an organic and natural part of the surrounding landscape, so that there is no disruption of the overall balance.

The protection of nature, its careful treatment and the intelligent use of all its riches are the constitutional duty and obligation of each Soviet citizen. The chief way of making qualitative advances in productive forces is naturally the transition to intensive development and the coordination of the advantages of our socialist order with the achievements of the technological revolution, Comrade Yu.V. Andropov said at the June plenum of the party central committee. Our attitude toward nature and its riches is one of the most important indicators of this qualitative advancement, a criterion of social maturity and a measure of the economic, social, cultural and technical development of society.

This provides more conclusive proof of the advantages of socialism. ONLY SOCIALISM CAN SOLVE ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS ON A COMPREHENSIVE AND PLANNED BASIS. These problems are discussed by the public and by party plenums and aktivs, and major decisions are made on them, because this is a matter of PARTY AND STATE POLICY.

In conclusion, I would like to say that there was a good reason for holding today's session of the coordinating council in Gagra. The Abkhaz Obkom, the Gagra party gorkom and gorispolkom and other offices have taken a qualified and intelligent approach to problems connected with the protection of the seacoast. We were convinced of this when we saw much of what had already been accomplished. The same can be said of our comrades from the Adzhar ASSR and other parts of the republic who are present here today.

This proves once again how important it is that not only republic organs, but also local party committees -- party obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms -- and ispolkoms of oblast, city and rayon soviets of people's deputies become actively involved in environmental protection. Their administrators are personally responsible for the state of affairs in this sphere.

If trees are not planted in a city or rayon, if hunting and fishing stocks are depleted, if trees along the highway are rotting, if warped metal structures are disfiguring the landscape and if other outrages are committed, it means that the territory has no real master, it means that the first secretary of the party raykom, the chairman of the ispolkom and other administrators are not doing their job.

We can and must not only preserve what we have received from previous generations but also augment our natural riches and turn them over to our children in a renewed and more beautiful state. This is why we are using this rostrum today to address an earnest appeal to all administrators of party, soviet and economic organs and of trade-union organizations and to our younger generation -- Komsomol members and Pioneers -- TO LOVE, PRESERVE AND AUGMENT OUR NATURAL WEALTH AND DO EVERYTHING WITHIN THEIR POWER TO MAKE EACH SPOT IN OUR SUNNY REPUBLIC EVEN MORE BEAUTIFUL!

We must do everything within our power to ensure that environmental protection becomes a major party and state objective in our republic, so that we can lead the rest of the country in this area and augment the priceless riches of our great motherland!